

Also, memorial of San Francisco Labor Council, relative to higher compensation for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of board of directors of the California State Automobile Association, relative to regulation of interstate use of automobiles; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of Mr. Frank H. Newhall, advocating the passage of House bill 5010, relative to salaries of the United States Steamboat-Inspection Service; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TAGUE: Memorial of board of representatives of Federal Employees Union No. 2, protesting against the withdrawal of the right of postal employees to organize in affiliation with other workers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. VARE: Memorial of Federal Employees Union No. 2, against Postmaster General relative to organization by Government employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, January 25, 1918.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God our Father, who searchest the inmost recesses of the heart, turn on the Divine light, we beseech Thee, and help us to realize our deficiencies as individuals and as a Nation; that we may measure up to the larger life, revealed in the Lord Jesus Christ; and conscientiously and efficiently do the work Thou hast given us to do, leaving the results to Thee, who doest all things well; that we may have the approbation of our own conscience and at last receive the heavenly benediction, "Well done, good and faithful servant, enter thou into the joy of thy Lord." For thine is the Kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 9054, the Agricultural appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on going into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York makes the point of order that there is no quorum present, and evidently there is not. The Doorkeeper will lock the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 299, not voting 129, as follows:

YEAS—299.

Alexander	Cary	Elliott	Hadley
Almon	Chandler, N. Y.	Ellsworth	Hamilton, Mich.
Anderson	Church	Elston	Hamlin
Ashbrook	Clark, Pa.	Emerson	Hardy
Aswell	Classon	Esch	Harrison, Miss.
Ayres	Claypool	Fairfield	Hastings
Bacharach	Collier	Fess	Haugen
Bankhead	Connally, Tex.	Fisher	Hawley
Barkley	Connolly, Kans.	Flood	Hayden
Barnhart	Cooper, W. Va.	Fordney	Hayes
Beakes	Cooper, Wis.	Foss	Heaton
Bell	Copley	Foster	Heilin
Beshlin	Cox	Francis	Helm
Black	Cramton	Freeman	Helvering
Blackmon	Crisp	French	Hensley
Blanton	Crosser	Fuller, Ill.	Hersey
Borland	Darrow	Fuller, Mass.	Hicks
Brand	Decker	Gallagher	Hilliard
Britten	Denison	Gallivan	Houston
Brodbeck	Denton	Gandy	Huddleston
Browne	Dewalt	Gard	Hull, Tenn.
Browning	Dickinson	Garner	Igoe
Brumbaugh	Dies	Garrett, Tenn.	James
Buchanan	Dill	Garrett, Tex.	Johnson, Ky.
Burnett	Dillon	Gillett	Johnson, Wash.
Burroughs	Dixon	Glass	Jones, Tex.
Butler	Domnick	Glynn	Juul
Byrnes, S. C.	Doolittle	Goodall	Kearns
Byrnes, Tenn.	Doremus	Goodwin, Ark.	Keating
Campbell, Kans.	Doughton	Gordon	Keohoe
Campbell, Pa.	Dowell	Gould	Kelley, Mich.
Candler, Miss.	Drane	Graham, Ill.	Kelly, Pa.
Caraway	Dupré	Gray, Ala.	Kennedy, Iowa
Carew	Dyer	Green, Iowa	Kennedy, R. I.
Carter, Mass.	Eagle	Greene, Mass.	Key, Ohio
Carter, Okla.	Edmonds	Gregg	Kincheloe

King	Mays	Rogers	Stevenson
Kitchin	Meiritt	Romjue	Stiness
Knutson	Miller, Minn.	Rose	Strong
Kraus	Montague	Rouse	Summers
La Follette	Moon	Rowe	Sweet
Langley	Moore, Pa.	Rubey	Swift
Larsen	Moore, Ind.	Russell	Tague
Lazaro	Morgan	Sabath	Taylor, Ark.
Lea, Cal.	Neely	Sanders, Ind.	Taylor, Colo.
Lee, Ga.	Nelson	Sanders, La.	Temple
Lehibach	Norton	Sanders, N. Y.	Thomas
Lenroot	Oldfield	Saunders, Va.	Thompson
Leshner	Oliver, Ala.	Schall	Tillman
Lever	Oliver, N. Y.	Scott, Iowa	Timberlake
Linthicum	Osborne	Scott, Mich.	Tinkham
Little	Overmyer	Sears	Towner
Littlepage	Overstreet	Sells	Treadway
Lobeck	Padgett	Sherwood	Van Dyke
London	Palge	Shouse	Vestal
Lobergan	Park	Siegel	Vinson
Lufkin	Peters	Sims	Voigt
Lundeen	Phelan	Sinnott	Volstead
Lunn	Platt	Sisson	Waldow
McAndrews	Polk	Slayden	Walsh
McArthur	Powers	Slomp	Walton
McClintic	Pratt	Sloan	Wason
McCoormick	Purnell	Smith, Idaho	Watson, Pa.
McFadden	Quin	Smith, Mich.	Watson, Va.
McKeown	Ralney	Smith, C. B.	Webb
McKinley	Raker	Snell	Welling
McLaughlin, Mich.	Ramsayer	Snook	Welty
McLaughlin, Pa.	Randall	Snyder	White, Me.
McLemore	Rankin	Stafford	White, Ohio
Madden	Reavis	Stegall	Williams
Magee	Reed	Stedman	Wilson, Tex.
Mansfield	Robbins	Steele	Wingo
Mapes	Roberts	Steenerson	Young, N. Dak.
Martin	Robinson	Stephens, Miss.	Zihlman
Mason	Rodenberg	Sterling, Ill.	

NOT VOTING—129.

Anthony	Fairchild, G. W.	Kiess, Pa.	Scully
Austin	Farr	Kinkaid	Shackelford
Baer	Ferris	Kreider	Shallenberger
Bland	Fields	LaGuardia	Sherley
Booher	Flynn	Longworth	Small
Bowers	Focht	McCulloch	Smith, T. F.
Caldwell	Frear	McKenzie	Stephens, Nebr.
Cannon	Garland	Maher	Sterling, (Pa.)
Cantrill	Godwin, N. C.	Mann	Sullivan
Capstick	Good	Meeker	Switzer
Carlin	Graham, Pa.	Miller, Wash.	Talbot
Chandler, Okla.	Gray, N. J.	Mondell	Templeton
Clark, Fla.	Greene, Vt.	Morin	Tilson
Coady	Griest	Mott	Vare
Cooper, Ohio	Hamill	Mudd	Venable
Costello	Hamilton, N. Y.	Nicholls, S. C.	Walker
Crago	Harrison, Va.	Nichols, Mich.	Ward
Currie, Mich.	Haskell	Nolan	Watkins
Curry, Cal.	Heintz	Olney	Weaver
Dale, N. Y.	Holland	O'Shaunessy	Whaley
Dale, Vt.	Hollingsworth	Parker, N. J.	Wheeler
Dallinger	Hood	Parker, N. Y.	Wilson, Ill.
Davidson	Howard	Porter	Wilson, La.
Davis	Hull, Iowa	Pou	Winslow
Dempsey	Humphreys	Price	Wise
Dent	Husted	Ragsdale	Wood, Ind.
Dooling	Hutchinson	Ramsey	Woods, Iowa
Drukker	Ireland	Rayburn	Woodyard
Dunn	Jacoway	Riordan	Wright
Eagan	Johnson, S. Dak.	Rowland	Young, Tex.
Estopinal	Jones, Va.	Rucker	
Evans	Kahn	Sanford	
Fairchild, B. L.	Kettner	Scott, Pa.	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. YOUNG of Texas with Mr. GARLAND.

Mr. DALE of New York with Mr. DALE of Vermont.

Mr. VENABLE with Mr. DAVIDSON.

Mr. CALDWELL with Mr. WILSON of Illinois.

Mr. THOMAS F. SMITH with Mr. WARD.

Mr. CARLIN with Mr. AUSTIN.

Mr. WRIGHT with Mr. DAVIS.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska with Mr. BLAND.

Mr. WHALEY with Mr. WHEELER.

Mr. SHERLEY with Mr. CANNON.

Mr. WATKINS with Mr. WOOD of Indiana.

Mr. BOOHER with Mr. TILSON.

Mr. SMALL with Mr. DEMPSEY.

Mr. TALBOTT with Mr. TEMPLETON.

Mr. CLARK of Florida with Mr. BOWERS.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana with Mr. RAMSEY.

Mr. CANTRILL with Mr. WOODS of Iowa.

Mr. SULLIVAN with Mr. DUNN.

Mr. WISE with Mr. CHANDLER of Oklahoma.

Mr. WALKER with Mr. PARKER of New York.

Mr. COADY with Mr. WINSLOW.

Mr. STERLING of Pennsylvania with Mr. GEORGE W. FAIRCHILD.

Mr. WEAVER with Mr. GOOD.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia with Mr. ANTHONY.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER with Mr. BENJAMIN L. FAIRCHILD.

Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina with Mr. MORIN.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY with Mr. MOTT.
 Mr. JACOWAY with Mr. CURRIE of Michigan.
 Mr. SHACKLEFORD with Mr. KAHN.
 Mr. JONES of Virginia with Mr. MUDD.
 Mr. OLNEY with Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. SCULLY with Mr. MEEKER.
 Mr. MAHER with Mr. SANFORD.
 Mr. RUCKER with Mr. MONDELL.
 Mr. HAMILL with Mr. FARR.
 Mr. KETTNER with Mr. NOLAN.
 Mr. RIORDAN with Mr. MCKENZIE.
 Mr. HOOD with Mr. NICHOLS of Michigan.
 Mr. RAYBURN with Mr. MILLER of Washington.
 Mr. FLYNN with Mr. LONGWORTH.
 Mr. NICHOLS of South Carolina with Mr. KREIDER.
 Mr. PRICE with Mr. KINKAID.
 Mr. POU with Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. HUMPHREYS with Mr. IRELAND.
 Mr. HOWARD with Mr. HUTCHINSON.
 Mr. HOLLAND with Mr. HUSTED.
 Mr. FERRIS with Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH.
 On this roll call:
 Mr. FIELDS with Mr. COOPER of Ohio.
 Mr. EVANS with Mr. FOCHT.
 Mr. ESTOPINAL with Mr. HASKELL.
 Mr. EAGAN with Mr. FREAR.
 Mr. DOOLING with Mr. GRIEST.
 Mr. DENT with Mr. GREENE of Vermont.
 Mr. DALE of New York with Mr. GRAY of New Jersey.
 Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote "aye," although I have a pair with my colleague from Maryland, Mr. TALBOTT. If he were present, he would vote "aye" also.
 The name of Mr. BROWNING was called, and he answered "Yea."
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
 The SPEAKER. A quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will unlock the doors.

PENSIONS.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker—
 The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Virginia rise?
 Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I want to submit a request for unanimous consent. I have conferred with the gentleman from South Carolina, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, that has charge of the bill now under consideration, and I wish to make a unanimous-consent request that as the first legislative business to-morrow we take up the bill H. R. 9160, which is a bill from the Invalid Pensions Committee, providing pensions and increase of pensions.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] asks unanimous consent that the first legislative bill to be considered to-morrow shall be the bill from the Invalid Pensions Committee. Is it an appropriation bill?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. It is an appropriation bill.
 Mr. GILLET. I suppose that is because we give up to-day, which is regular pension day.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes. I will say in that connection that the bill is only a short one, and will take but 15 or 20 minutes.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the statement of the gentleman from Virginia that this bill will only take a few minutes in the morning, so far as I am concerned I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. These bills never take any considerable length of time. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

WIDOWS' PENSIONS.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to submit a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ASHBROOK. The bill H. R. 9093, a bill to amend the widows' pension bill, appears on the House Calendar. I wish to inquire if it should not appear on the Union Calendar?

The SPEAKER. What is it?

Mr. ASHBROOK. It is a bill to amend the widows' pension bill. Of course it calls for an appropriation.

The SPEAKER. Is it a general bill?

Mr. ASHBROOK. It is a general bill.

The SPEAKER. Then, of course, it ought to be on the Union Calendar.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I then ask unanimous consent that the bill H. R. 9093 be transferred to the Union Calendar, and also that it appear on the calendar before the bill

H. R. 3547, which is a bill from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, as it was the understanding of the committee that the bill H. R. 9093 should first be reported.

The SPEAKER. You do not have to have any consent. The Chair puts it on the calendar as an original date.

Mr. ASHBROOK. A further inquiry. I wish to know, in view of the fact that the bill H. R. 3547 now appears on the Union Calendar as No. 93, whether or not this bill, now having been transferred to the Union Calendar, will follow H. R. 3547?

The SPEAKER. It is transferred as of the original date.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Both bills were filed the same day, but H. R. 9093 was filed first, with the understanding that it should so appear on the calendar.

The SPEAKER. Understanding with whom?

Mr. ASHBROOK. In the committee; and it was filed first by the clerk of the committee.

The SPEAKER. Well, the Clerk will put them on the calendar that way.

AGRICULTURE.

The motion that the committee resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 9054, with Mr. CHASE in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill of which the Clerk will report the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9054) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER]. [Applause.]

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I am very much gratified to be received, as I have been this morning, with the cheers of my fellow Members. [Applause.] It must be this splendid bill under consideration, however, you applaud, rather than me.

This bill presented by the Committee on Agriculture for your consideration deals only with the activities of the department itself. It was thought best that the appropriation bill be confined to the activities of the department and not enter upon any other field, but to reserve the other matters which may come up subsequently for further consideration, to be presented in another bill at the proper time.

If the membership will take occasion to read and to examine the very splendid report made by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture [Mr. LEVER], on behalf of the committee, they will find a full and complete explanation of practically every provision in the bill, rendering it unnecessary to enter into a detailed discussion. Suffice it, therefore, to say this bill carries a total amount of \$26,943,773. This is an apparent increase of \$1,014,660 over the appropriation for the year 1918.

In the consideration of the bill the committee had before it representatives of the department, explaining its various provisions and the necessity for the appropriation. In some instances, as shown by the decrease in special items in the appropriation, it was thought by the committee necessary to make these reductions. In some instances increases were made in some of the provisions recommended by the department for justifiable reasons presented to us at the time. This shows that the bill received in all of its details full and careful consideration by the committee, and that it is a bill presenting in substance the best judgment of the whole committee in reference to the matters with which it deals. Therefore I trust when we come to the consideration of the bill for amendment under the five-minute rule, that there will be no captious objections or any unnecessary delay in the consideration of its various provisions, but that the Membership will cooperate with us who compose the committee as far as possible to expedite its passage in order that we may pass it here and send it to the Senate as soon as possible so that other important measures may as rapidly as possible receive consideration at the hands of the House.

While this bill is not in a strict and technical sense a war measure, still I do want to impress upon the House that every bureau and division of the great Agricultural Department is engaged in work to help us in winning the war; and the appropriations in this bill are for the basic groundwork and fundamental activities of the department, which stand under and uphold all the extensive and emergency work being done in

the real war work; and therefore these appropriations are necessary to keep all the work going as a harmonious system.

In this connection, therefore, I desire to call attention to the situation that existed in this country at the beginning of the war, and to the response which has been made by the people throughout the country in meeting the necessities which were then shown to exist in the condition which prevailed at that time. The Secretary says in his report:

When, on April 6, 1917, the existence of a state of war with Germany was declared by Congress, this country was facing an unsatisfactory situation in respect to its supply of foods and feedstuffs. The production in 1916 of the leading cereals, corn, wheat, oats, barley, rye, buckwheat, rice, and kafirs, was comparatively low, aggregating 4,806,000,000 bushels, as against 6,010,000,000 for 1915, 4,983,000,000 for 1914, and 4,884,000,000 the annual average for 1910-1914. The wheat crop of 1916 especially was strikingly small. It was only 639,886,000 bushels, as compared with the record production for 1915 of 1,026,000,000, with 891,000,000 for 1914, and with the average for the five years 1910-1914 of 728,000,000. It was certain, too, that on account of adverse weather conditions, the output of winter wheat for 1917 would be greatly curtailed. The world production of wheat for 1916 also was unsatisfactory, and the prospects for the ensuing year were not good. The situation was no better in respect to another conspicuously important food commodity, the Irish potato. The yield of this crop for 1916 in the United States was only 285,437,000 bushels, while for 1915 and 1914, respectively, it was 359,721,000 and 409,921,000. For the period 1910-1914 it averaged 360,772,000.

Now, then, with those conditions surrounding the country at that time, strenuous efforts were made by this department in order to bring those facts to the attention of the country and to appeal to the people to put forth every patriotic effort to remedy them by increasing the production of food and feedstuffs. The response made by the farmers of the country is shown in the report of the Secretary of Agriculture. The Secretary says:

Imbued with patriotic motives, influenced by favorable market prices, and falling in with the suggestions of the Department of Agriculture and of State agricultural agencies, the farmers of the Nation manifested much interest in the campaign for increased production and displayed efficient activity in reference both to plant and animal foodstuffs and feedstuffs. The weather conditions during the spring were generally favorable, and according to the unrevised estimates the Nation will have as the result of the work of the farmers and of all the agricultural agencies approximately 3,191,000,000 bushels of corn, 659,797,000 of wheat, 1,580,000,000 of oats, 201,659,000 of barley, 56,000,000 of rye, 16,813,000 of buckwheat, 33,256,000 of rice, 73,380,000 of kafir, 439,686,000 of Irish potatoes, 84,727,000 of sweet potatoes, 15,957,000 of commercial beans, 42,606,000 of peaches, 11,419,300 of pears, 177,733,000 of apples, and 7,621,000 tons of sugar beets. These figures represent increases of cereals in the aggregate over 1916 of 1,006,000,000 bushels and over the average for 1910-1914 of approximately 1,000,000,000 bushels, but a decrease of production in comparison with 1915 of about 199,000,000 bushels. It should be borne in mind, however, that the carry over of cereals from last year was much below the normal, and that the percentage of soft corn of the 1917 crop was unusually high. The figures also reveal the record crop of Irish potatoes of 439,686,000 bushels, 154,000,000 more than in 1916, and 79,000,000 more than the average for 1910-1914; an increased production of sweet potatoes over 1916 of 14,000,000 and of 24,000,000 over the five-year average; and of sugar beets of 950,000 tons over 1916 and of 2,230,000 over the five-year average. There was also the largest production of perishables on record. While authentic figures for meat, poultry, dairy products, and vegetable oils are not available for 1917, it appears, from rough estimates, that the quantity of these commodities for this year is slightly greater than for either 1916 or 1915 and exceeds the five-year average by two or three billion pounds.

The number of milch cows and other cattle has shown an increase during the last four or five years, the estimate for the former for the present year being 23,906,000 as against 22,768,000 a year ago and 20,497,000 in 1913, before the European war began, while that for the cattle is 43,291,000 as against 40,849,000 a year ago and 36,030,000 in 1913. Unfortunately, the number of sheep continues to decline; the estimate for 1917 is only 46,059,000 as against 48,483,000 a year ago and 51,482,000 in 1913. It is estimated that the number of hogs, which during recent years has shown an upward tendency, decreased over 4,000,000, or from 67,543,000 to 62,747,000. However, it is greater than it was at the beginning of the European war.

These patriotic activities of the farmers have largely contributed to swell to enormous proportions our foreign trade, which is shown in this statement:

COUNTRY'S FOREIGN TRADE EXCEEDS \$9,000,000,000: TOTAL FOR 1917 A GAIN OF \$1,300,000,000 OVER 1916.

The country's foreign trade amounted to over \$9,000,000,000 in 1917, exports reaching a total of \$6,226,000,000, while imports amounted to \$2,952,000,000, according to a statement just issued by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Department of Commerce. This is a gain of nearly \$1,300,000,000 over 1916, when the total trade amounted to \$7,874,000,000.

DECEMBER EXPORTS AND IMPORTS.

December exports amounted to \$589,000,000, an increase of no less than \$100,000,000 over November. The imports for December amounted to \$228,000,000, an increase of \$7,000,000 over November.

Free imports formed 76 per cent of the total in December and 72 per cent of the total for the calendar year.

The excess of exports over imports has nearly doubled in the last two years, amounting to \$3,274,000,000 in 1917, against \$3,091,000,000 in 1916, and \$1,776,000,000 in 1915.

IMPORTS AND EXPORTS OF GOLD.

The imports of gold during December amounted to \$2,500,000, as compared with \$159,000,000 in December, 1916. For the year the gold imports amounted to \$538,000,000, against \$686,000,000 in 1916. The exports of gold amounted to \$4,500,000 in December, 1917, against \$28,000,000 in December, 1916. For the year the gold exports amounted to \$372,000,000, as compared with \$156,000,000 in 1916.

Silver imports amounted to \$6,000,000 in December, as compared with \$3,500,000 for the corresponding month in 1916, and to \$53,000,000 for the year, against \$32,000,000 in 1916. Exports of silver were valued at \$10,000,000 in December, 1917, and \$9,000,000 in December, 1916. For the year the silver exports amounted to \$84,000,000, against \$71,000,000 for 1916.

The foregoing facts show that there was a ready response by the farmers throughout the country when they knew the condition that existed and the necessity for increased production. They thus always show their love of country and evince the spirit which has ever been among them from the days of the Revolutionary fathers, who were farmers in this land, then almost a wilderness, who, led by that matchless farmer, military genius, and statesman, George Washington, secured for us American rights and liberties and the blessings of this Republic. [Applause.]

Whenever the farmers of the United States have realized that there was any just demand made upon them of any character to come to the rescue of the country they have always shown the greatest patriotism and responded to every reasonable request made of them. [Applause.] They not only always responded in time of peace but always as well in time of war.

There are three things absolutely necessary in order to bring about a successful conclusion of the world contest in which we are now engaged: First, we must have men; second, we must have the money; and third, we must have the food. Without men it is impossible to carry on war. Without money it is impossible to pay the expenses, and without food it is impossible to feed the soldiers. Men who are not fed, and well fed, are unable to fight. The farmers throughout the United States are responding along all of these lines. They are patriotically inspiring the young men of the land and furnishing their sons to go to the front in defense of the colors and the flag which we love. [Applause.]

They are subscribing to liberty loans and helping with their money to furnish the necessary sinews of war to enable the boys to do their full duty at the front, and then they are patriotically responding by an increased production of foodstuffs and feedstuffs to maintain our Army and feed our allies. All honor to the farmers of America and all patriotic citizens who are faithfully and loyally upholding their country's cause. [Applause.] This is our record in all the history of the past from the very commencement of this great Republic in which we live, through all the vicissitudes and changes that we have undergone, to this present hour.

I read a short time ago a statement by Richard T. Edmonds, the editor of the *Manufacturer's Record*, published in Baltimore, in which he defines the meaning of this great war in which we are engaged, in which statement I believe our patriotic and liberty-loving people agree. He says:

Germany's war is a definite war of atheism against Christianity, of barbarism against civilization. If we would—because Germany hates us more than it hated either Belgium or France—save this country from even greater horrors than Belgium and France have suffered, it is absolutely incumbent upon us to uphold the Nation to the utmost extent of our moral, physical, and financial power in this life and death grapple. There is no middle ground. Victory or defeat are the two issues at stake.

To win, every effort of the Nation to the last ounce of its strength—in the building of ships, in food production and food conservation, in increased output of iron and steel, in bettering our transportation facilities by rail and highway and water—must be put forth in enthusiastic, unending work by the men and women of this country.

It is incumbent upon everyone who realizes this situation to do his very utmost to awaken the latent patriotism of others and to quicken the knowledge of all, that they may understand the magnitude of the task and the stupendous issues involved—and these issues are the life or death of our Nation and of all civilization.

Carry into every home, preach from every pulpit, teach in every school the meaning of the war and the individual responsibility of every man, woman, and child in the country. Not until as a Nation we do this will the women and the children and the very life of our country be made safe from the danger of the awful destruction wrought in Belgium and France and wherever the armies of Germany have marched.

This defines and gives the meaning of this great war in which we are engaged. Germany forced this war upon the world. One man, the Kaiser, by his own edict, involved all the civilized nations of mankind in the world conflict that has literally set the world on fire, and he to-day is responsible for the situation that exists; and he to-day is the one man in all the universe who could by a word or edict, as he began it, end it and bring peace to the nations of mankind.

For more than 40 years he prepared. Not satisfied and not content with the fact that the other nations were willing that the tocsin of war be not sounded and that the dove of peace should hover over the peoples of the earth, he began to shake his mailed fist, rattle his shining sword, express his dissatisfaction at the conditions existing, and to declare "Me und Gott" supreme, and served notice upon the world that he would declare war unless certain demands that he made were complied with, and complied with within the short limit of 24 hours. When those demands were not complied with, then in accordance with

his previous announced purpose he did declare war, and, calling out his armies, which were ready for the conflict, within 12 days, as we well remember, he had 5,000,000 men armed to the teeth and at the front to engage in the awful and horrible tragedy which has continued during the terrible years now passed. He announced his purpose at the very beginning, and that was that he would subjugate the nations of the Old World first, and when he had subjugated them and become the supreme ruler beyond the seas he would cross the ocean to this beautiful land of ours and take down the emblem of liberty—the Stars and Stripes—and substitute in their place the flag of the German Empire, which represents autocracy and despotism.

Not only did he announce this to be his purpose and desire, but his minister of war announced it at the same time, showing that they had previously discussed it and had arrived at a conclusion in respect to it, and that it was the fixed purpose in their minds and hearts not only to engage in war with the nations across the sea but to cross over to this side and subjugate this free Republic and force it to become a dependent Province of the German Empire. Having announced that to be his purpose, he proceeded across the little country of Belgium. When his attention was called to the fact that he had entered into a solemn treaty, not only that he would not invade Belgium but that, on the contrary, he would protect its sovereignty and the security and the safety of its people, he admitted that he had entered into this solemn treaty and compact, but with a fiendish smile on his face declared he was to be supreme in all the universe, and said it was but a "scrap of paper" and he had torn it up.

His purpose was to reach France and reach the city of Paris as soon as it was possible to do so, subjugate that country first, because it was believed to be the best prepared country on side of the German Empire itself. Therefore, if he could subjugate it and convert to his own purpose and use the resources it contained, combine them together, he could overrun the other nations on the other side, and when they were subjugated combine the powers of all the nations beyond the seas under one great head, he to be that supreme head and directing force, and then cross the ocean and subjugate this country of ours and make it subservient to him. "Me und Gott," he declared, would do this.

Following this purpose and this design, he absolutely destroyed the little country of Belgium. Not being satisfied with that, he turned to poor little Serbia, that had in humiliation and in the dust agreed to every demand made on her, and absolutely destroyed it. His armed forces killed Red Cross nurses, sunk hospital ships, made breastworks out of defenseless men, women, and children, and sacked the towns, killing the unarmed inhabitants and treating the women and girls in a manner which can not be described in a public audience.

A short time ago a gentleman was delivering an address before the Red Cross Society in the city of Washington, and he said he had traveled through that little country of Serbia since this awful destruction. He said there was nothing to indicate that people had lived there except the smokeless chimneys that lifted their heads toward the skies, silent and solemn witnesses of the horrible tragedy that had been committed in that beautiful little land; that there was no evidence of thrift, no evidence of production, or anything of that kind, but devastation and destruction everywhere; and as he traveled along he noticed by the roadside bundles of clothing, which attracted his attention. Upon investigation, he found there was nothing within them. When he inquired what these smokeless chimneys meant, what the bundles of clothing meant, the reply was made, "Do you not know the German Army has been here? These smokeless chimneys are the silent witnesses to bear testimony to the awful devastation and destruction of this little country; these bundles of clothes at some time surrounded the body of an unarmed man or a helpless woman or innocent child who was ruthlessly slain without justification or cause." Not only were their bodies slain and hurled by the roadside to return to the dust from which they came, but they took their bones—bones of men, women, and little innocent children—and ground them into fertilizer to scatter over their soil to enrich it in order to increase production to maintain their army at the front. An army fighting for autocracy, fighting for despotism, fighting for the iron heel of oppression, against the army fighting for liberty, fighting for truth, fighting for righteousness and Christianity. They took the bones of innocent little children, converted them into fertilizer, which shows by its conversion the terrible and horrible contempt which they not only had for a defenseless people themselves but for their bones when their flesh had returned to the dust from which it came. [Applause.] Mother, you are in the gallery kindly listening to me to-day, and, father, you are here. How would you feel toward a people who would thus treat your little innocent, helpless child? God grant that

we may all be saved from such awful sorrow and indescribable suffering by keeping Germany away from our shores, and to this end may the God of justice and the right nerve the arms of our brave soldier boys and give us through them triumphant victory. [Applause.]

So, by a violation of treaties, by the violation of all international law, agreements at The Hague, and the law of God they involved all the nations beyond the seas in this awful and this horrible conflict. The question is sometimes asked—I have it asked of me—Why is it that we, the United States of America, are involved in this awful and horrible conflict? Germany took possession, or attempted to take possession, of a part of the sea and notified us and all the nations of the world that if we attempted to come within what they called the war zone our ships would be sunk, our commerce would be destroyed, and our citizens would be killed. Not only did they make this threat, but they proceeded at once to put it into execution. As fast as vessels reached the war zone they were sunk. They created this war zone not in accordance with international law because it is unknown in international law. There was no agreement for it made at The Hague. There is no law for it written in any statute book. It was simply established by edict and by their serving notice upon all nations of the world that they must not go beyond a certain limit—500 or 1,000 miles out in the ocean and 1,000 or 1,100 miles long. They notified not only other nations, but the United States of America that we must not cross the barred zone. If they had the right to order us off a part of the seas, they had a right to order us off every single drop of water in the seas. [Applause.]

They forgot that we fought the War of 1812 for the freedom of the seas. That was the substance of everything involved in that contest. Our ships were being searched by England, our sailors were being taken off our ships, and England denied our right to the freedom of the seas—our right to engage in commerce unmolested. We served notice on them that if that continued there would be trouble between us. It did continue, and the War of 1812 between England and the United States was fought and victory came to the American arms, and our right to unmolested commerce and to the freedom of the seas was settled. It had never been denied previous to that time and never has been denied since that time until it was denied by Germany in the instance to which I have referred.

Not only that, but they fired upon our flag itself 24 different times. To fire upon the flag of the United States is an act of war, but to fire upon that flag 24 times is 24 acts of war. Not only did they fire on the American flag 24 times, but they sunk 20 ships flying the American flag. I want you this morning to look at that picture just a moment. See a ship flying the Stars and Stripes, magnificently floating upon the ocean waves, on a peaceful voyage, sailing from a port where she has a right to sail and going to a port where she has a right to land, crossing the ocean upon which she had a right to travel, when all at once one of these assassins of the sea, a submarine, that travels beneath the surface of the water, rises to the surface and bang goes a torpedo, and the American ship begins to sink beneath the ocean waves. I want you to see that flag, beautiful as it is and love it as we do, sinking gradually until it disappears beneath the surface of the ocean and then see the German flag floating triumphantly above the surface. Do you like that picture? I do not, and I am sure you do not. Not only did they sink our ships, but in addition to that they killed our citizens, more than 500 of them, unarmed and defenseless—men, women, and children, whom they sent to the bottom of the seas without justification and without excuse—in violation of international law, in violation of agreements entered into at The Hague, in violation of the laws of God, and in violation of the laws of humanity. Then, people say sometimes that the United States of America has no cause to be in this terrible war, which has been thus brought upon us and which we have been forced to engage in contrary to our desire, contrary to our purposes, and contrary to our wishes. We did everything to avoid it. God knows I did not want any war. Our great President did not want war.

He was as patient as Job himself and endured time after time the awful criticism not only on this side of the water but beyond the seas, until finally the time came when patience ceased to be a virtue, and there was nothing else left for us to do except to participate in the war in defense of our country, for the protection of our flag, and the perpetuity of this Republic. When that time came he did not hesitate, and when that time came we did not hesitate, and I do not believe that the people of the United States at the present time are hesitating as to what our duty is or what course we shall pursue. Not only did they do this, but as we well remember they attempted to stir up insurrection in our own country by telling the negroes that they

had not had their rights fully accorded to them in this country, and that if they would join with them in a conspiracy to overthrow the beautiful land in which we live that they then would be fully accorded the rights to which they were entitled and they should control and rule this land and the white people should be subservient to them instead of their being subservient to the white people. Think of that! Not only that, but they held out the inducement to Mexico that if she would join with them—and also to Japan, if she would join and help them overthrow this country—that they should be paid in our land; that Mexico should have the States of Texas, New Mexico, and Arizona, and that Japan should have California, Oregon, and Washington. In other words, they proposed to administer upon our estate and divide it up before we were dead. They proposed to take six beautiful stars from the flag which we love, which shine in their brilliancy and glory in that emblem of liberty, representing six sovereign States, and confer them upon a foreign power, upon an alien thus opposed to us and to our institutions; but, thank God, no nation in all the universe has ever been able to take a single star from that flag, and by the help and grace of the God of righteousness and of truth and of justice they never will. [Applause.]

They filled our country with spies, of whom old Bernstorff seems to have been chief, and interfered with our internal and domestic affairs. Therefore, not only have they interfered with our international commercial rights and killed our people, but they have attempted to stir up neutral nations against us and within our borders insurrection among our own people, inviting them to join with them in a conspiracy to overthrow and destroy us, and holding out to them promises of reward in the future, to be accorded to them from the resources which we possess.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. LEVER. I yield to the gentleman such further time as he desires to use. I am greatly interested in his speech and see others are. [Applause.]

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I thank the distinguished chairman of the committee for his kindness.

Another very serious reason for our being in this war was caused when the Kaiser, agreeing with the President of the United States that he would desist from the horrible submarine warfare in which he had engaged for so long, and that no more would be resume it in the future, then, without consultation of any kind, simply served notice upon us during the latter days of last January that upon the 1st of February he would again resume the unrestricted submarine warfare and thus begin again to sink our ships, destroy our commerce, and kill and slaughter our people. He did not consult with us. He had entered into a solemn agreement, in one sense of the word a treaty, between his country and our country, agreed to by him and by the President of this great Republic, that he would never again engage in unrestricted submarine warfare, which he agreed at that time was contrary to international law, contrary to any agreement of any kind entered into by any nations of the world, because wherever a ship, even of a belligerent, which is carrying unarmed passengers is captured, according to international law the passengers must be protected and taken to a place of safety before the ship itself can be sunk; and it was brought to the attention of the Kaiser that these submarines were unable to take from the ships noncombatants and unarmed passengers that might be upon them and protect them and carry them to a place of safety before the ship was sunk.

They could not carry lifeboats or life rafts or anything by which they might be taken to a place of safety, and therefore for that reason, because international law required that to be done, they were not such implements of warfare as could be used anywhere in war between the civilized nations of the world. Having consented to that, he agreed he would no longer engage in such warfare. But without consultation, without interchange of any communications, without even writing a letter, he simply served notice on this Republic that at a certain time he himself, by virtue of his supreme power and divine commission to rule the world, would resume this unrestricted submarine warfare, which he had agreed was contrary to international and all other law.

Not only did he announce that, but he resumed it, and the ships began to go down, one after another, until the number went up into the hundreds; 839 ships were sunk, of which 20 were flying the American flag. Again he was in reality and demon-like cruelty not only destroying our property, but murdering our citizens. He had announced that the treaty which he had made to protect Belgium was simply a scrap of paper which he had torn up. He did not believe that the Belgian people would fight, but brave and chivalrous as they were, they did resist the invasion of their country and they fought to the death. Those of the membership of this House who have been

there recently and had an opportunity to come in personal contact with those brave people, say that they are standing there upon the little piece of land that is yet left to them, proclaiming with fire in their eyes that they will fight to absolute extermination before they will permit the giving up of their land forever. [Applause.] He thought that he could tear up a scrap of paper, thought those people would not fight and were unable to fight. He presumed, I believe, that he could tear up an agreement made with the United States of America and say it was "a scrap of paper."

But, my friends, when he assumed to tear up as "a scrap of paper" an agreement between the President of the United States and himself not again to engage in this submarine warfare he called us one time too many, and the answer will be given by the boys who are now crossing the seas and who will carry Old Glory in their hands and wear the uniform of a soldier of the United States of America. [Applause.] When that answer is given to him it will be in no uncertain tones. It will be in the same spirit of 1776 and with the same aggressiveness that has been shown by our people in all the days that are past. It will be with bravery; it will be with chivalry; it will be with pure purpose and patriotic desire to uphold the right and overcome the wrong, and thereby add new luster and glory to our flag. So these are the reasons, my friends, which involved us in this war. They are the conditions that surrounded us, from which there was no escape. We had to do one of two things. We either had to fight or we had to run. Our flag has never trailed in the dust or gone down in defeat. We never have run in the days past and we never will run in the days to come. [Applause.] Some people say we declared war upon Germany. We never have declared war upon Germany up to this present moment when I stand before you here on the floor of this House. We simply passed a resolution declaring that a state of war existed between the United States and Germany. We declared that Germany was making war upon us, and, that being true, there was nothing for us to do except to defend ourselves. [Applause.] I want to ask you if they were not making war upon us when they were proposing to divide up our territory and to confer it upon other powers; if they were not making war upon us when they sent our flag beneath the ocean, to the bottom of the sea; when they were violating agreements entered into with us; and when they were killing our men, women, and children, shedding innocent blood, and sending them to the bar of eternity? If that was not war, what would be war?

We either had to fight or we had to take the other alternative. What was that? We either had to fight or to take down that flag that flies from this Capitol to-day, that flag that flies upon this Capitol, near the Goddess of Liberty that stands upon the dome of this majestic building, and take down the flag that flies from the flagstaff above the Executive Mansion, where lives to-day our great President of these United States, and put in their places two white rags as an emblem of our degradation and of our shame [applause] and send a peace commission across upon the other side and say to the Kaiser, "Mr. Kaiser, we have come to turn over to you the United States of America. It is true our forefathers fought for it and shed their precious blood upon its sacred soil in order to secure to us the great Republic in which we live, and in which we enjoy American rights and American liberty [applause]; but we, as unworthy sons of worthy sires, propose to surrender it to you without a contest. We want you to come over there and take our country, kill our old men as you have killed them in other countries you have subjugated, and you had better kill the young men, too, because some of them might be ashamed of their daddies and shoot at some of your folks and might hit you. Kill our little innocent children like you have slain them in other countries. Sprinkle over the fair land their innocent blood. Then take our beautiful women, the best, the purest, the most beautiful women in all the universe of God [applause], the women from whose eyes flash the sunshine of God's Heaven, upon whose cheeks is the glow as beautiful as the softest and sweetest tinge of the rose that bloomed in Paradise itself, from the fountain of whose heart flows the most innocent and purest blood that ever coursed the veins of God's best creation; yes, come and take mother, daughter, and sister; yes, come and take them all and treat them as you treated the good women and pure girls in the other nations across on the other side which you have subjugated and brought beneath the iron heel of your oppression and of your destruction. Treat them in such a manner as can not be described in a public audience anywhere under any circumstances." My friends, that was all there was left for us to do. We had no other alternative, and I want to say to you, before I would have taken that course and thus surrendered our country and our people to the Kaiser, I would have turned my back upon this historic hall and walked barefooted a thou-

sand miles home and gone into oblivion the balance of my days. [Great applause.]

The question is frequently asked why we are fighting across the seas. I will tell you. Listen to this: Rev. Newell Dwight Hillis, pastor of Plymouth Church, Brooklyn, N. Y., went across the ocean and made a personal investigation, and here is an extract from what he told his congregation upon his return in an address in that church:

Here upon this pulpit rests a reproduction of an iron coin given as a token to each German soldier. At the top is a German portrait of Deity, and underneath are these words: "The good old German God." To encourage the German soldier to cruelty and atrocity against Belgians and French the Deity holds a weapon in his right hand, and to dull his conscience and steel his heart to murder the token holds these words: "Smite your enemy dead. The day of judgment will not ask you for your reasons." The German atrocities of the last three years illustrate that German efficiency reached its highest point in the discovery of new and horrible devices for torturing old men, helpless women, and little children.

For three years German-Americans have protested that the stories of German atrocities were to be disbelieved as English inventions, Belgian lies, and French hypocrisies, but that day has gone by forever. When the representatives of the nations assemble for the final settlement there will be laid before the representatives of Germany affidavits, photographs, with other legal proofs that make the German atrocities to be far better established than the scalplings of the Sioux Indians on the western frontiers, the murders in the Black Hole of Calcutta, or the crimes of the Spanish Inquisition. On a battle line 300 miles in length, in whatsoever village the retreating Germans passed, the following morning accredited men hurried to the scene to make the record against the day of judgment. The photographs of dead and mutilated girls, children, and old men tell no lies. Jurists rank high two forms of testimony—the testimony of what mature men have seen and heard and the testimony of children too innocent to invent their statements, but old enough to tell what they saw.

For the first time in history the German has reduced savagery to a science; therefore, this great war for peace must go on until the German cancer is cut clean out of the body.

The cold catalogue of German atrocities now documented and in the government archives of the different nations makes up the most sickening page in history. Days spent upon the records preserved in southern Belgium, northern France, or in and about Paris, days spent in the ruined villages of Alsace and Lorraine, leave one nauseated, physically and mentally. It is one long, black series of legally-documented atrocities. Every solemn pledge that Germany signed a year and a half before at The Hague Convention as to safeguarding the Red Cross, hospitals, cathedrals, libraries, women and children, and unarmed citizens are scoffed at as a "scrap of paper." These atrocities also were committed not in a mood of drunkenness nor an hour of anger, but were organized by a so-called German efficiency and perpetrated on a deliberate, cold, precise, scientific policy of German frightfulness. It is not simply that they looted factories, carried away machinery, robbed houses, bombed every farm house and granary, left no plow nor reaper, chopped down every pear tree and plum tree and every grapevine, and poisoned all wells! The Germans slaughtered old men and matrons, mutilated captives in ways that can only be spoken of by men in whispers; violated little girls until they were dead; they thrust women and children between themselves and soldiers coming up to defend their native land; bombed and looted hospitals, Red Cross buildings; violated the white flag—while the worst atrocities can not even be named in this mixed audience.

The war general gave each German soldier his token, large as a silver dollar, bidding the soldier "Strike him dead. The day of judgment will ask you no questions." Jesus said, "Take heed that ye offend not one of My little ones." The Kaiser says, "I have done away with Jesus' teachings." The Master, who loved the little children, said, "I was an hungry and ye gave me no meat. I was athirst and ye gave me no drink. Therefore, depart from me into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his fellows." The war staff answers, "Don't be afraid. Look at your token. The Kaiser will take care of you in the day of judgment. Kill old men and little children, loot merchants' houses, violate women; the Kaiser will see that the God of justice asks you no questions." The result was logical and inevitable. These horrible atrocities!

Now, here is what Capt. A. P. Simmons, a United States military observer in Germany during the mobilization, having been attached to the American Embassy at Berlin, says:

Don't let any one tell you that German atrocities are merely fiction. One of the most grieveous sights I ever saw was the impaling of babies on the ends of German bayonets and their return to frantic mothers. If you knew the horrors that patient, suffering little Belgium has been through your blood would freeze in your veins.

With knowledge of these awful atrocities do you further ask why we are fighting across the seas? We have joined our allies and are fighting over there because, first, it is best, safer, and wiser to join with them and with our combined strength, resources, and power resist Germany all together, than to wait and fight single handed and alone ourselves against Germany after she had overcome all the other Nations and combined them against us, as we certainly would have to do; and second, because we want to keep Germany out of America. God forbid they should ever invade our country and destroy our cities, devastate our farms, kill our old men and innocent children, and treat our women as they have treated those across the seas. May we, by fighting over there, save our people from the awful atrocities and fiendish and brutal treatment described by Rev. Dr. Hillis and Capt. Simmons. [Applause.]

I have been asked when I thought peace would come. I fully agree with the President of the United States in what he announced not long ago as he stood at that desk on that subject. No greater address was ever delivered to Congress, if, indeed, it has ever been equaled. But I will tell you when peace will

come, and it will not come before. It will come when our allies and our boys, wearing the uniform of the United States and carrying Old Glory, shall march through the German Empire to the city of Berlin and absolutely hurl the Kaiser and those in power with him from their present places of position and imaginary supremacy to the bottomless pit of the infernal regions, where they belong, and where they ought to have been long ago. When they shall destroy autocracy and despotism, the iron heel of oppression, and substitute in its place democracy, righteousness, truth, and Christianity, and send liberty, shining like the sunshine of God's heaven, all around this world in which we live, and raise the flag of the United States of America to the topmost pinnacle, where all the nations of the earth can pay tribute to it and recognize it as the flag of equity, of justice, of righteousness, of truth, and of Christianity, and the flag that came to the rescue and saved the civilization of the world for all future time, then shall peace come, and not before, for there can be no abiding or permanent peace until these results are accomplished. [Loud applause.]

I thank you from the bottom of my heart, gentlemen of the House, for your close attention and generous evidences of approval of what I have had to say for your consideration. The issue is made up, and it is whether we shall stand by our great President, for our flag, and for our country. Let us all do so and our people will sustain us, and the God of our fathers will bless us and give to our country victory and permanent peace. [Great applause.]

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 40 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM].

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, on page 13 of this bill appears an item as follows:

For investigating the disease of tuberculosis of animals, for its control and eradication, for the tuberculin testing of animals, and for researches concerning the cause of the disease, its modes of spread, and methods of treatment and prevention, including demonstrations, the formation of organizations, and such other means as may be necessary, either independently or in cooperation with farmers, associations, State or county authorities, \$250,000.

There was no similar item in the act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture approved March 4, 1917.

I do not know of any item in this bill that is more important than this, and in the hopes that this item may be hereafter amended, I am calling attention to it at this time.

Tuberculosis, as affecting our live-stock industry, has not, in my judgment, received proper attention on the part of our Government, neither in Congress by adequate appropriations, nor by the Agricultural Department of the Government. I dare say this is because of the fact that it is not a malignant disease, quick in its effect, but a disease the spread and growth of which is so almost imperceptible that we do not observe it. However, no one thing is so threatening to the live-stock industry to-day as this disease.

Tuberculosis in live stock is essentially a disease of the stock-feeding, breeding, and dairy farms, where the cattle and swine are stabled and housed. In the ranges of the West and Southwest it is comparatively unknown. Wherever cattle and hogs are kept housed and confined, there tuberculosis breeds and spreads. Its growth is so rapid as to threaten to-day the dairy and breeding and cattle-feeding industry of the country.

By using abattoir statistics and the results of tuberculin tests made at various places we can, with reasonable accuracy, tell how widespread this disease is. Dr. Davis S. White, in his *Principles and Practice of Veterinary Science*, states:

In the United States 1 per cent of the cattle are found tuberculous on slaughter, and 2.5 per cent of the hogs. Results of tuberculin tests on 400,000 head of cattle gave 10 per cent reacting. It is very probable that 1 per cent of the beef cattle and 10 per cent of the dairy and stud herds of this country are tuberculous.

I am inclined to think Dr. White is below the real facts in his estimate. An inspection of the condemnations of animals at slaughter, as given in the Yearbook of the Department of Agriculture of 1916, shows the percentage of animals condemned has risen from 1.58 per cent in 1907 to 3.35 per cent in 1916. I insert the table here:

Condemnations of animals at slaughter, 1907-1916.

Fiscal year.	Cattle.		
	Whole.	Part.	Per cent.
1907.....	27,933	93,174	1.58
1908.....	33,216	67,482	1.41
1909.....	35,103	99,739	1.84
1910.....	42,426	122,167	2.07
1911.....	39,402	123,969	2.10
1912.....	50,363	134,783	2.46
1913.....	50,775	130,139	2.53
1914.....	48,356	138,085	2.77
1915.....	52,496	178,409	3.32
1916.....	57,579	188,915	3.35

This, I believe, is largely due to the growth of tuberculosis. The Secretary of Agriculture reports (Annual Report 1916, p. 15) that tuberculosis in live stock causes annually losses of \$25,000,000.

In older countries, where the disease has been unchecked, it is destroying the live-stock industry. In Germany, before the war, nearly 21 per cent of the cattle and 3 per cent of the swine killed for food have been found tuberculous, while the tuberculin test showed over 50 per cent of all cattle tested reacting. Fully 25 per cent of the cattle in Germany before the war were affected, and in France 10 per cent.

War is a degenerative process, and in times of war the enforcement of our laws of sanitation and health becomes somewhat slack. For this reason we ought now to make ample provision to see that this white scourge does not gain on us during this war. Not only must we do this to conserve our meat supply, but to protect the health of our people. Tuberculosis in cattle is transmissible to human beings, and we can not afford to temporize with the health of our babies, the hope of the Nation for the next generation.

Milk drawn from tuberculous animals, as well as cheese, butter, and other raw products manufactured from it, are a source of danger to consumers. (Yearbook, Department of Agriculture, 1910, p. 235.)

That the scourge can be checked there is no question. In 1909, in the District of Columbia, a system of tuberculin tests and killing of diseased animals was initiated. In eight years the percentage of animals affected in the District has fallen from 18.87 per cent to 1.1 per cent.

The Department of Agriculture has as yet made no effort to systematically attack this disease. Such efforts as have been made are spasmodic and local. If there are not laws adequate to authorize the department to act, Congress should pass such acts, and I respectfully urge upon this committee that they give attention to this matter. The strictest kind of interstate regulations as to the shipment of tuberculous live stock should be made and enforced. Where tuberculosis is present let it be stamped out by effective quarantine and slaughter, if necessary. Let some concerted plan be adopted and then followed. It is idle for us to stand by and merely contemplate the situation, saying, as the Secretary of Agriculture does in his report of 1916:

Its very magnitude discourages the undertaking of any general plan of eradication.

If there are not sufficient laws, let the Secretary of Agriculture suggest proper ones to Congress; if the laws are adequate, then he ought to be given ample funds and requested to act. This appropriation is, in my judgment, just one-half of what it ought to be; it should be \$500,000.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. Has it not been demonstrated that in many instances animals suffering from tuberculosis have gotten well, and that the post-mortem examinations have demonstrated that fact?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. And that that same animal, if given the tuberculin test, would show the curve of infection; and is it not a fact that the great difficulty in handling this proposition is what to do with those animals, and if we undertake to slaughter them, will we not slaughter hundreds of thousands of animals in the country that might otherwise recover?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I agree with my colleague. I think the best method of handling this proposition is not by indiscriminate slaughter, as was undertaken in the foot-and-mouth disease, but by quarantine wherever it is necessary and segregating these animals in the hope that they will recover. Frequently animals that are tuberculous will recover and are found on slaughtering not to be tuberculous, and frequently tuberculous animals if kept together and segregated will produce offspring not tuberculous. For that reason indiscriminate slaughter would not be desirable.

While the stock raisers of the Eastern, Northern, and Central States are seeing this plague decimating their herds and reducing their agricultural wealth and are restricted as to their expenditures to \$250,000, the farmers of the South and Southwest are, by this bill, carefully protected by adequate appropriations. For instance, I observe that for the eradication of the cattle tick of the South there is appropriated \$620,420; for methods of meeting the cotton boll weevil, \$650,410; for the eradication of the pink bollworm, \$500,000. It is extremely evident that the cotton-producing States intend to look after their own. Here is a total of \$1,150,140 expended to control diseases of cotton, while \$250,000 is expended to control tuberculosis; and this is true, although the total value of the cotton crop of this country last year was \$1,517,558,000, and the total

value of the cattle and swine on the farms of the country was \$2,257,028,000.

The great live-stock industry of the North and East and Central States is not being properly guarded in this bill in comparison with the care which is used to protect the interests of the farmers of the cotton-growing States. It is high time this should be done.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 40 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN].

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, since history's dawn tuberculosis has been the scourge of man and the affliction of the brute. Dr. Flick, medical director of the Henry Phipps Institute for Prevention and Study of Tuberculosis, answering his own question "Where did the first case of consumption come from?" said "Where did the first man come from?"

Moses, in Leviticus, twenty-sixth chapter, thirteenth to sixteenth verses, and twenty-eighth chapter, twentieth to twenty-second verses, flaunts it as a penalty before his people, and places a ban upon the afflicted brutes' flesh as an offering. Isaiah, the orator, chapter 10, verses 16 to 23, and Daniel, the judge, chapter 10, verse 17, both tell of its ravages and terror. To the chosen people tuberculosis, next to leprosy, had the greatest terror of all diseases. It is a remarkable fact that this people are to this day the most nearly immune of all the civilized nations to tubercular attack. It was, however, their great affliction while in Babylonish captivity. That was a time when Hippocrates, the great Greek physician, lived and administered to the sick and wrote of their ills. It was probably more prevalent then than now.

Seven centuries later Galen, the Greek stoic physician who acquired the title of Paradoxologus as well as Paradoxopones, who was physician to two Roman emperors and medical guardian of Commodus, son of Marcus Aurelius, told of its prevalence in Rome, whose people took it, with their other evidences of civilization and weakness, from the Greeks, who obtained it from Egypt, the home of medicine and disease. Egypt in the distant ages probably obtained it from the Far East, the home of wisdom, art, wickedness, and weakness.

Dr. Moore, of Cornell University, says, "The Talmud, especially the Mishnah, codified at the close of the second century, and the Gemara in the fifth century contained numerous enactments against the eating of such flesh." He goes on further to say that in the ninth century the Franks enacted laws against eating tubercular flesh; later the various German States, running down from century to century, and other countries, in addition to forbidding the eating, denounced the sale and gradually took control in various forms of inspection to protect the public. Dr. Moore observes, "The United States stands foremost in the efficiency of this service."

When animal tuberculosis came to America can not be precisely stated. Cattle, the leading food-producing animals, were brought to this country by the various European navigators and colonizers. Probably bovine tuberculosis came with them. Hogs, the second food-producing animal, and second only to cattle in loss from tuberculosis, were brought here about the same time, but hog cholera did not appear until much later. Tuberculosis probably came with these animals or soon thereafter.

While in every decade we have been endeavoring to improve our breeds by infusing new and stronger blood, we have also been propagating disease. In this, like in all else, we progress, but always with some penalty as the price.

As I have said, the United States has the best system of meat inspection. It is more expensive than that of any other nation. For the year 1918 we appropriated for that purpose the sum of \$501,620. The large purpose of this expenditure is to detect and dispose of at the slaughter end of our food animals the individuals and parts of individuals unfit for human consumption. It occurs to me that if we would have pure water for our use, while it is well to filter at the point of consumption, would it not be well to purify the source. So if we are to spend largely at the point of inspection after slaughter, would it not be wise to purify at the source of life and growth.

Tuberculosis affects a large, though varying, percentage of cattle according to the locality, but greatest, of course, in the North, and amounting to 63,000,000 head of cattle, and all the hogs in the United States, about 67,000,000, or a total of 130,000,000, while the total cattle possible to be affected by the tick number only 20,000,000 head.

As has been well said from this floor, \$620,000 is appropriated in this bill for the eradication of the cattle tick, affecting only comparatively few animals—20,000,000—as compared with \$250,000 provided for a disease that affects 130,000,000. I do not quarrel with the \$620,000 appropriation for cattle tick, because I am in favor of this Government exercising all of its

energies and using largely of its means to make good its own appeal for increased food production, but in the light of the number of animals affected by these two diseases, \$620,000 is absolutely indefensible if \$250,000 for the eradication of tuberculosis is allowed to stand.

Tuberculosis in live stock is an older disease than hog cholera and cattle tick. Among scientific men it is understood as well as either one. The methods of dealing with the problem are also well understood and practically agreed upon. The serious problem for solution lies among interested parties. First, the owner of the animal, in which lies perhaps the means of his livelihood, and who can not for purely altruistic purposes test and slaughter upon either suspicion or proof of the disease. Second, the State or community interested in the nonspread of the disease, both from the standpoint of profitable industry and the public health. Third, the Government, whose present concern is for the saving of what food we have and the production of a large increase in meats, as well as the general public health. Moreover, since more than half the inspected meat and meat animals move in interstate commerce under the supervision and control of the General Government, the Government has a manifestly large interest in the control and the eradication of this source of loss and danger.

The bases for this enterprise are, first, economic; second, sanitary. These are, of course, not stated in the order of their ultimate importance to the Nation.

Dr. Moore states the economic features of loss to owners of live stock as follows:

1. By destroying cattle outright, as when tuberculosis is allowed to reach its full development and kill its victim.
2. By reducing the market value of the animal, as in those cases in which the beast is sold before the disease has reached such a stage as to render it entirely unmarketable.
3. By reducing the breeding value of a herd and its general productivity.
4. By causing a waste of cattle food by animals that can not give an adequate return.
5. By infecting other animals, such as calves, swine, and other cattle through the milk and through direct contact.
6. By injuring the reputation of the herd, thereby rendering it difficult to dispose of the animals or their products.
7. By destroying the enthusiasm or interest of the breeder in the maintenance of his herd at a high standard.

These are important at this time, when the Nation is making special appeals to the live-stock owner to speed up production of beef and pork. Moreover, regular days are set aside when we are enjoined not to eat meat, that the supply for our armies may not fail.

It is a hollow mockery for appeals to go out from Washington to every man who owns a beef or pork brute to feed them until they can have the maximum amount of food product upon the basis of that brute life, and then not respond to a fair appeal to reduce the loss incident to this great ravage which the producer must meet. Thousands of men in my own State, and I am one of them, feed cattle now against an almost certain loss. For two reasons we continue it. First, we hope, perhaps, that the price may change so that we may be adequately recompensed, and, secondly, and more important, it is in response to patriotism on account of the demand of the Government to produce as many pounds of beef or pork as possible.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SLOAN. With pleasure.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Does not the gentleman think a larger appropriation ought to be given and some law giving greater activity to this work ought to be enacted?

Mr. SLOAN. I quite agree with the gentleman from Maryland, who I know for more than two years has been deeply interested in this proposition, interested more particularly from the sanitary angle than the economic. I know the interest he has taken, and I know the large amount of information he has gathered, and I quite agree with him that what we should do is to do just what Dr. Mohler, head of the Bureau of Animal Industry, would be willing to do and will do if this Congress will permit him, and that is to make this appropriation a million of dollars, so that he can inaugurate a man-sized campaign against tuberculosis to bring about a reduction the very first year and the final eradication of this great scourge which I am discussing from an economic standpoint, of which ultimately from the sanitary phase, which in the mind of the gentleman from Maryland, is the more important.

We should move in this matter with haste and care combined. We are in better condition than European countries, which have not met this problem as they should, and in partial consequence thereof are now, in the stress of war, feeling the effects of their partial neglect.

In the matter of this appropriation I do not know precisely what is in the mind of the Secretary of Agriculture, an official for whom I have the utmost regard for his patriotism and

ability. When I say that I am not giving him mere lip service I mean it. I think that perhaps he does not desire to shoulder the responsibility of a large appropriation—I am not quoting him—he may properly want to leave it where it belongs, with the Congress. If the Congress wants this campaign, I have no doubt the Department of Agriculture will see to it that it is vigorously carried on. The man in the Department of Agriculture at the head of the Bureau of Animal Industry believes in this campaign and believes that \$1,000,000 can be effectively used with satisfactory results.

Renneberger estimated the loss of the cattle industry in Germany, due to tuberculosis before the war, to have been more than 90,000,000 marks annually, which would be \$18,000,000. Dr. Moore, quoting Renneberger further, says:

The slaughterhouse statistics of Prussia show 14.6 per cent of the cattle and 2.14 per cent of the hogs to be tuberculous. In Saxony the percentage is 29.13 for cattle and 3.10 for hogs. In the city of Leipzig the figures are 36.4 per cent for cattle and 2.17 per cent for hogs (Siedamgrotzky). Of 20,850 animals in Belgium tested with tuberculin in 1896, 48.88 per cent reacted (Stubbe). Of 25,439 tested in Denmark from 1893 to 1895, 49.3 per cent reacted (Bang). An examination of 20,930 cattle in Great Britain, either slaughtered and examined post-mortem or tested with tuberculin, showed 5,441, or 26 per cent, affected with tuberculosis. McFadyen estimates that 30 per cent of the cows in Great Britain are tuberculous.

Why do I mention this? I mention it to show what America's opportunity is if it will rise to it.

Dr. A. D. Melvin, late head of the Bureau of Animal Industry, himself a victim of tuberculosis, in the American Veterinary Review of 1908, said:

While the saving of human life affords the highest motive for combating tuberculosis, the prevention of financial loss is alone a sufficient reason for undertaking the eradication of the disease from farm animals. Statistics of the United States Federal meat inspection for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908, covering 53,973,337 animals, or more than one-half of all those slaughtered for food in the country, show the following percentages of tuberculosis: Adult cattle, 0.961; calves, 0.026; sheep and goats, 0. The proportion of tuberculosis is probably higher in animals slaughtered without inspection. Reports of tuberculin tests made in the 15 years from 1893 to 1908 by Federal, State, and other officers with tuberculin prepared by the Bureau of Animal Industry have been carefully analyzed and tabulated. Out of 400,000 cattle tested, mostly dairy cattle, there were 37,000 reactions, or 9.25 per cent. From these two classes of statistics it is concluded that on an average about 10 per cent of the milk cows, 1 per cent of all other cattle, and 2 per cent of the hogs in the United States are affected with tuberculosis, the average percentage of all the cattle being estimated at 3.5.

I am going to give you some more figures. Then you will see that instead of being 2 per cent for hogs it is 10 per cent for hogs, as will be stated by another authority. This statement was made in 1908 by Dr. Melvin. Now, I proceed:

The accuracy of the tuberculin test has been confirmed in a remarkable way by post-mortem examinations. Out of 23,869 reacting cattle slaughtered, lesions of tuberculosis were found in 23,585, a percentage of 98.81.

So we have a test that is almost infallible, and it is as certain and accurate as any disease test of which I know.

Properly prepared tuberculin applied by a competent person is, therefore, shown to be a wonderfully reliable agent for diagnosing tuberculosis. In cases where the test appears to give unsatisfactory results, this is usually due to the use of a poor quality of tuberculin or to ignorance or carelessness in applying it.

The economic loss on account of tuberculosis in food-producing animals is heavy. The loss of animals in which tuberculosis is found in the Federal meat inspection is estimated at \$2,382,433 annually, and if the same conditions were applied to animals slaughtered without Federal inspection the annual loss for all animals slaughtered for food in the United States would increase to \$3,102,433. The stock of animals on hand is also depreciated in value because of tuberculosis. Assuming that living tuberculous milk cows are annually depreciated to the extent of one-tenth of what the loss would be if they were slaughtered, other cattle one-third, and hogs one-half, the total annual depreciation amounts to \$8,046,219. The annual loss from decrease in milk production is estimated at \$1,150,000, and there is also some loss from impairment of breeding qualities. Taking all these items into account, the aggregate annual loss of tuberculosis in the United States is estimated at not less than \$14,000,000.

Such heavy financial losses make the eradication of tuberculosis from farm animals desirable purely as an economic matter.

That was in 1908; increased value of cattle, increase of disease. Nobody fixes the estimate at over \$30,000,000 to \$35,000,000 and none place it at less than \$25,000,000.

Dr. John R. Mohler, now head of the Bureau of Animal Industry, and perhaps the best authority on this subject in America, in response to an inquiry which I submitted to him relative to tuberculosis, its spread, and the methods and prospect of eradication, stated as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY,
Washington, D. C., July 26, 1917.

Hon. CHARLES H. SLOAN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SLOAN: I take pleasure in transmitting herewith an article on tuberculosis eradication work prepared in accordance with your telephone request, together with bulletins and other papers relating to that disease.

Very truly, yours,

J. R. MOHLER,
Acting Chief of Bureau.

THE ERADICATION OF TUBERCULOSIS FROM LIVE STOCK.

Tuberculosis can be eradicated from all the cattle and all the swine in this Union; otherwise the Department of Agriculture would not have embarked upon such a tempestuous campaign.

To support such a broad assertion, there is an abundance of evidence obtained through the school of experience, covering a period of several years.

Tuberculosis has been eradicated from hundreds of herds in the District of Columbia, Virginia, Maryland, and other States. It has been practically exterminated from comparatively large circumscribed areas. Furthermore, wherever and whenever an effort was made to eradicate the plague and the earnest cooperation of the live-stock owners and officials has been obtained, success has never failed to crown the enterprise.

Herds of cattle, which have at the inception of the campaign contained 75 per cent of diseased animals, have been freed of the malady and have remained as free herds.

Herds which on the first test were found free of disease have, by the prudent care of their owners, been kept free of tuberculosis.

The experience the department has had, as outlined here, has been enjoyed by the veterinary officials of some States. The preponderance of successful experiments, if we may call them such, is convincing proof that when conditions are favorable tuberculosis may be eradicated.

What constitutes favorable conditions? The same state of mind of the people that obtained in the early nineties when pleuropneumonia was eradicated; in 1902, 1908, 1914, and 1915 when outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease were eradicated; the spirit that pervaded the Western States during the cattle and sheep scabies eradication campaign; the spirit that is aiding in the eradication of hog cholera; the same state of mind, the same earnest, hearty, wholesome, and substantial cooperation that has made Texas fever eradication the marvel of live stock sanitary achievements.

Now, that is not an estimate by some expert outside of the Department of Agriculture, but by the Bureau of Animal Industry. It is the statement of the responsible head of that bureau under whose charge this campaign would be placed if given opportunity by Congress to attempt it in man fashion.

The American people can eradicate tuberculosis, or prevent its eradication, or increase its presence.

In 1907, the bureau first undertook systematic investigations in regard to the eradication of bovine tuberculosis and the results which have been obtained through 10 years of study indicate that the eradication of tuberculosis of cattle and swine is probably the largest and most difficult problem which the bureau has undertaken to solve for the benefit of the live-stock industry and the general public, which benefits from the advancement of that industry.

It has been clearly demonstrated that tuberculosis can be eradicated from herds which are heavily infected with the disease and that tuberculosis herds can be freed from tuberculosis and maintained in a healthy condition through a period of years. In the demonstration work which has been conducted in the State of Virginia the past fiscal year showed 127 herds of cattle to be without the infection of tuberculosis at the time bureau cooperation was established. In the same State 138 infected herds have been made free from tuberculosis and in accordance with the knowledge of the bureau this was accomplished in 126 cases without reinfections occurring. A large proportion of the herds were made free as the result of a single carefully applied tuberculin test followed by the removal of reactors and the disinfection of the buildings. A second retest showed the eradication to have been completed in about 25 per cent of the herds.

The eradication of tuberculosis from cattle within a restricted area is a reasonable proposition as demonstrated in the District of Columbia, where in 1909 a compulsory tuberculin test became effective, and it was found that 18.67 per cent of the District cattle were tuberculous. This percentage was reduced as shown by the first retest to 3.2 per cent and during the fiscal year terminating June 30, 1917, only 0.84 per cent of the District cattle reacted to the tuberculin test.

It may also be of interest to note that reactions to tuberculin tests applied by inspectors of this bureau are confirmed by post-mortem examinations, exhibiting lesions of tuberculosis in between 98 and 99 per cent of the reactors which are slaughtered under Federal supervision.

The years during which these investigations have been in progress have seen the live-stock owners and the live-stock sanitary authorities awakened to a realization of the necessity and importance of combating the spread of tuberculosis which has already made inroads in practically every section of the United States. This is especially true of the sections where intensive live-stock breeding and dairying have been practiced. In the South where this industry has been maintained in its infancy largely on account of the prevalence of the Texas fever, cattle ticks, and the lack of diversified farming interests, the rapid eradication of these ticks, and the progress of the propaganda for diversified farming is making a new and large field for the development of both the beef and dairy cattle industries. The cattle in these sections are now but slightly infected with tuberculosis, and it would seem to be of special importance that these sections be given protection from the introduction of tuberculous cattle from the infected localities.

Forty-seven of the States require the tuberculin test as a qualification for the entry of dairy or breeding cattle, but the owners of valuable herds have realized that a greater health insurance is obtained in the purchase of cattle from herds which are officially known to be free from tuberculosis.

This has led to the establishment by this bureau and by some of the States of what are known as accredited tuberculin tested herds. This plan is meeting with great favor, especially among the breeders of pure-bred and registered cattle who recognize in it a medium for increasing the volume of their business and for protecting their own valuable herds when pure-bred cattle of other blood lines are introduced for improving the strains.

On July 2, 1917, bureau offices were established at Richmond, Va.; Springfield, Mass.; Indianapolis, Ind.; South St. Paul, Minn.; Salt Lake City, Utah; and Portland, Ore.

The Richmond office will have supervision over tuberculosis eradication in Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and adjacent States in cooperation with the officials of those States. In the State of Virginia the pure food and dairy commissioner has detailed one veterinary inspector to cooperate with the bureau veterinarians. It is expected that in the near future the commissioner will have sufficient funds which will permit of the employment of several more inspectors to cooperate with the Federal force.

The work in North Carolina will be conducted in cooperation with the director of extension work. The State has assigned Dr. G. W. Roberts, professor of veterinary science at the Agricultural and Mechanical College, to work for the summer months. He will be succeeded by another qualified veterinarian in the fall. The Department of Agriculture has furnished one inspector to aid in the campaign. It is expected that immediate plans will be made for active work in South Carolina, as numerous owners of pure-bred cattle have signed up agreements to have their herds tuberculin tested.

The Springfield office will direct the work in the New England States. The campaign has already been opened in Vermont. The commissioner of agriculture for that State has employed a veterinarian and the department has detailed an employee.

There are a number of owners of pure-bred cattle in Connecticut with whom the department has been cooperating and which form a nucleus for eradication work in that State.

In the other New England States it is expected that cooperative forces will be engaged in the eradication campaign in the near future.

The Indianapolis office will supervise the cooperative campaign which will be conducted in Kentucky, Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, and Wisconsin.

The South St. Paul office will do similar work in Minnesota, Montana, North and South Dakota.

The two other offices will engage in cooperative work in Idaho, Utah, Washington, and Oregon.

The department's policy in tuberculosis eradication is a cooperative one. For every Federal employee furnished the State is expected to provide at least one veterinarian.

Just one other excerpt which I shall read from Dr. Mohler:

That there will be mistakes made and failures encountered is a foregone conclusion. It will not be uncommon to encounter the individuals and officials who will have grave forebodings of the success of the campaign, and some will prophesy abject failure. We should not be cheered too much by the forecasts of the enthusiasts or depressed inordinately by the predictions of the glooms.

Tuberculosis can not be wished away; neither can it be talked out of existence. The State must pay to exterminate it, since it has tolerated its existence these many years. The United States Congress and the legislatures of the various States will appropriate funds for the maintenance of fighting forces to cope with the situation. The live-stock owners have duties no less important than the aforementioned forces. Teamwork among all the forces will produce results which will be worth striving for and which will mean another glory for live-stock sanitation.

Mr. HENSLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. SLOAN. I will be glad to do so.

Mr. HENSLEY. In order to corroborate what the gentleman is saying along that line, I would speak of just one instance I have in mind. There are a number of herds of cattle in Missouri where tuberculosis prevailed and has been eradicated. In one instance there was a milch cow, a Jersey, as pretty as a picture. I have forgotten how much milk she gave, but quite a quantity of milk. The owner of that cow refused to believe she had any tubercular trouble. He went over to the slaughter pen and saw her slaughtered. After he saw her slaughtered he said that her udders were absolutely rotten. He said, "I will never disbelieve it again." There is not any sort of question about it, and he never buys milk for his family now without first knowing that the herd from which the milk comes has been tested.

Mr. SLOAN. I thank the gentleman for his statement. It is quite true. One of the most serious propositions about this is the insidious way in which it works, and from the physical appearance how deceptive it is to know the truth about the presence or absence of tuberculosis.

There is just one reliable way of discovering it in life, and that is by the tuberculin test. Of course, the other means is the post-mortem.

Is it not a mighty good thing now and then to read a statement like that from a red-blooded man like Dr. Mohler, at the head of a great bureau of this Government, who tells the American people what should be done, how to proceed, and what can be accomplished? So it is up to this Congress to say we have faith in the man who has accomplished so much. He believes with that amount of money he can accomplish much toward eradication of tuberculosis. It is up to us to give him the opportunity, and let the Congress of the United States assume the responsibility.

Commissioner of live stock for the Chicago Live Stock Exchange, H. R. Smith, formerly for 10 years at the head of the department of animal husbandry at the State University of Nebraska, afterwards in a similar position in the State University of Minnesota, has submitted at the hearings before the Committee on Agriculture some very interesting and valuable information touching a number of phases of this tuberculosis problem. I recommend their reading.

Commissioner Smith presented among other things the following statement as to losses and prevalence of disease in the United States:

LOSSES CAUSED BY THIS DISEASE.

According to the records of the Meat Inspection Division of the United States Bureau of Animal Industry there were 25,975 beef carcasses and 44,492 pork carcasses condemned as inedible for tuberculosis alone at the seven leading Middle West markets—Chicago, Kansas City, Omaha, East St. Louis, St. Paul, Sioux City, and St. Joseph—during the fiscal year 1916. This is the equivalent of 50 trainloads of cattle and hogs of 40 cars each that were consigned to the rendering tanks at these

markets during one year because of having tuberculosis in so generalized a condition as to make the entire carcasses fit only for grease and fertilizer. There were a still greater number of carcasses passed for sterilization and sold as second-class canned beef and pork, upon which the loss was approximately 50 per cent.

PREVALENCE OF THE DISEASE IN THE UNITED STATES.

Tuberculosis is found among cattle and hogs from the Atlantic to the Pacific coast. It is not as prevalent in the Southern States as in the Northern States. Cattle are much less numerous in the South, are not so closely confined, making the conditions less favorable for the spreading of the infection and because of the prevalence of the cattle "tick" causing Texas fever fewer well-bred imported cattle have gone into the South up to this time. The following table shows the number of cattle and hogs slaughtered at the seven leading Middle West markets during the fiscal year 1916, and the number retained for tuberculosis (affected with the disease), and the number sterilized and condemned for tuberculosis.

Station.	Slaughter.	Retained for tuberculosis.	Per cent of total kill retained.	Sterilized for tuberculosis.	Per cent of total kill sterilized.	Condemned for tuberculosis.	Per cent of total kill condemned.
CATTLE.							
Omaha.....	707,365	14,157	2.00	832	0.12	2,207	0.31
South St. Joseph.....	249,858	2,285	.91	74	.03	661	.26
Kansas City.....	934,111	7,415	.79	421	.05	1,876	.20
National Stock Yards.....	549,429	3,202	.59	301	.06	996	.18
Sioux City.....	217,022	8,676	3.99	333	.15	1,198	.55
Chicago.....	1,934,862	87,102	4.50	4,742	.25	16,496	.85
St. Paul.....	228,172	10,820	4.57	86	.03	2,440	1.05
SWINE.							
Omaha.....	2,176,215	176,312	8.10	8,006	.37	4,733	.22
South St. Joseph.....	1,836,207	66,742	3.69	957	.05	3,269	.18
Kansas City.....	2,730,977	89,841	3.29	3,224	.12	4,042	.15
National Stock Yards.....	1,552,196	119,291	7.68	2,983	.20	2,901	.19
Sioux City.....	1,165,249	177,965	15.27	7,691	.66	3,515	.30
Chicago.....	7,343,746	1,161,339	15.81	36,273	.50	24,526	.33
St. Paul.....	1,603,074	81,254	5.4	1,453	.09	3,056	.20

The above table from the Bureau of Animal Industry shows that the disease is more prevalent at the northern markets. A total of 40,000,000 hogs were slaughtered during the year 1916 at all packing plants in the United States where Federal inspection is maintained. Approximately 10 per cent of these were found on post-mortem to be affected with tuberculosis.

Dairy cattle are more tuberculous than beef cattle, and the percentage of infected cattle is usually higher in the States where more dairy cattle are owned. The disease is found to be quite prevalent in beef cattle even in the so-called range States.

PRESENT BASIS FOR COOPERATION.

The scientists and authorities of the Nation and States understand the methods for control and eradication of tuberculosis as well as they do of the cattle tick or hog cholera.

1. There is needed the spread of information by the usual methods of literature, lecture, and demonstration.
2. The coordination of the National, State, and community forces.
3. A wisely managed system of compensation wherein the owner will stand one portion of the net loss, the State or community a second portion, and the Government the third portion.

The success of the United States authorities in cleaning up tuberculosis in the District of Columbia area is an evidence of what can be readily done in other areas, which can soon be made State wide and ultimately nation wide in scope.

As an evidence of the desirability for national action, I will say that while every State has some activity in this work there are 48 different systems, which should rapidly be made approximately uniform. A number of the States have not thus far kept the Bureau of Animal Industry fully supplied with their legislation or regulations concerning this work. Neither have they been supplied to the Congressional Library. I found some difficulty in obtaining full and complete data of the laws and regulations of the 48 States. I was given, however, free access to all documents and data which the Bureau of Animal Industry had, and was rendered liberal assistance in gathering information relative to the States' work. Using this, and by correspondence with the authorities of all the States, many of whom gave me considerable information while some few were limited in the scope of their replies, I was enabled to prepare, and now present as a part of my remarks, an abstract of the laws and regulations and workings thereunder in each of the 48 States:

STATE SANITARY REQUIREMENTS GOVERNING ADMISSION OF LIVE STOCK IN REFERENCE TO TUBERCULOSIS AND LAWS AND REGULATIONS WITH REFERENCE TO THE CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF TUBERCULOSIS IN LIVE STOCK.

ALABAMA.

Health certificate, including tuberculin test, for breeding and dairy cattle over 6 months of age, and feeding and grazing cattle over 2 years of age. Cattle for feeding under 2 years old require affidavit of owner that they will be kept separate from other cattle. Calves from tuberculous cows not admitted. Tuberculous cattle must be reported to

State veterinarian, and such cattle can not be sold unless the seller notifies the buyer of the tuberculous infection. Tuberculous cattle must be kept in strict quarantine or isolation. Infected cattle must be slaughtered in city slaughterhouse, under supervision of city inspector; if at other place must notify State veterinarian at least five days in advance, so that he or his representative may be present. Use of tuberculous cows in dairies is strictly forbidden. All cattle reacting to tuberculin test shall be marked permanently for identification by branding with large "T" on left jaw.

ARIZONA.

State veterinarian has power to control contagious and infectious diseases under the general laws. All cattle imported shall be accompanied by health certificate, including tuberculin test for dairy and breeding cattle.

ARKANSAS.

Live-stock sanitary work under control of the board of control, State University. Health certificate for dairy and breeding cattle imported, including tuberculin test by official veterinarians.

Note from Dr. Mohler: State veterinarian expressed desire to have bureau employees cooperate with his force.

CALIFORNIA.

Law creates State veterinarian and gives him power to control and eradicate all infectious and contagious diseases. Dairy cattle and breeding bulls over 6 months of age when imported must be accompanied by health certificate, including tuberculin test. In lieu of health certificate and tuberculin-test record dairy and breeding cattle may be brought into the State when accompanied by signed statement of State veterinarian showing animals originated in herds free from tuberculosis and other communicable diseases.

COLORADO.

For importation of any bull over 6 months or any female cattle over 6 months old intended for dairy purposes animals must be accompanied with health certificate and a tuberculin-test chart, and copy must be filed with veterinary surgeon of State before cattle are shipped.

CONNECTICUT.

For importation of meat cattle over 6 months of age, permit from commissioner of domestic animals, health certificate, including tuberculin-test chart. Certificate must contain description of each animal, including age, breed, sex, and color, or numbered ear tags. When certificate is not provided meat cattle may be taken into the State under a permit from the commissioner of domestic animals and held in quarantine until examined and released by the commissioner. Commissioner to make tuberculin test of cattle within the State upon written application and at the expense of the owner, and issue a certificate and quarantine and brand the reactors, or he may appraise and kill the reactors.

DELAWARE.

Law creates live-stock sanitary board, with broad powers. Regulations provide that any cows or other cattle for dairy or breeding purposes coming into the State shall be accompanied by a certificate from an inspector in the State whence the cattle came, certifying that they have been examined and subjected to the tuberculin test and are free from disease. Cattle remain in the possession of the person who shipped them until live-stock sanitary board approves the certificate. Dairy cows and such other cattle as are for breeding purposes may be brought into the State under special permit for each shipment from the live-stock sanitary board. Such cattle shall remain in strict quarantine until examined by inspector of the board and tuberculin tested. They shall be kept apart from other cattle and the milk shall not be used or sold without previous sterilization by boiling.

FLORIDA.

Law creates live-stock sanitary board, with general powers for the prevention, suppression, and control of contagious and infectious diseases of cattle, hogs, and domestic animals, and grants them power to condemn and destroy any live stock so affected.

GEORGIA.

Law creates State veterinarian, with authority to formulate regulations necessary to check and suppress the spread of infectious and contagious diseases in live stock. Regulations provide that all cows, heifers, or bulls shipped or driven into the State must be accompanied by a health certificate, including a tuberculin test, which must be the thermal test and conform to certain other requirements. At option of State veterinarian all such cattle may be subject to a retest from 30 to 60 days after their arrival, and pending the results of the retest such cattle shall remain in strict quarantine. Regulations prohibit the use of tuberculous cows in dairies. Cattle reacting to the tuberculin test must be reported to the State veterinarian and branded "T. R." Sale of tuberculous cattle prohibited and must be slaughtered under the supervision of the State veterinarian.

IDAHO.

Health certificate, including tuberculin test, for cattle required for shipment into the State.

Note from Dr. Mohler: Tuberculosis-eradication work now being conducted in Idaho in cooperation with State veterinarian.

ILLINOIS.

Law relating to importation of cattle requires that all bulls, cows, or heifers exceeding 9 months old shall be covered by a certificate of health, including the tuberculin test made not more than 30 days prior to date of shipment, or by a permit for their consignment in quarantine for feeding purposes only. Bulls, cows, and heifers less than 9 months of age and steer or spayed heifers must be covered by an affidavit certifying to their classification. Cattle from herds which are officially registered by the authorities of the State of origin as "accredited herds" are not required to have tuberculin-test chart. Tuberculin test made for cattle within the State on application of owner, and all cattle reacting branded "T." No cattle forming part of the domestic herds of the State shall be subjected to the tuberculin test without the consent of the owner.

INDIANA.

Cattle imported into the State must have health certificate, including tuberculin test, if they are for dairy or breeding purposes. Calves under 6 months of age must have health certificate showing that they are from tuberculin-tested and free-from-tuberculous mothers. Cattle for feeding purposes covered by affidavit. No law which forces test on domestic cattle, but "accredited herds" are being established through organization and raising the requirements on milk and sale animals.

IOWA.

Cattle imported for dairy and breeding purposes must have health certificate, including tuberculin test. Cattle other than dairy and breeding cattle, except steers and cattle for immediate slaughter, shall be accompanied by a certificate of health and an affidavit certifying that the title of such cattle will not be transferred and that they will not be used for purposes other than feeding and slaughter without first notifying the State veterinarian and having them subjected to the tuberculin test. At last session of legislature the health commission undertook to have a bill passed authorizing the testing of dairy and breeding herds of cattle with appraisal of condemned animals and destruction of the same and providing for a special tax of 2 cents per head on cattle and 1 cent a head on hogs, which amount was to be used for the eradication of tuberculosis in live stock. This bill, if it had passed, would have provided about \$170,000.

KANSAS.

Law creates live-stock sanitary commissioner. Regulations provided that cattle imported for dairy or breeding purposes must be accompanied by a certificate of satisfactory tuberculin test, showing them free from tuberculosis, applied within 90 days prior to date of shipment. Not required for calves under 6 months of age. Test to be made by Federal inspectors or veterinarians certified by authorities of the State of origin, but from New York State only on the test of Federal inspector. All cattle originating at public stock yards to be used for dairy purposes, registered cattle or native cattle for breeding purposes, must be tuberculin tested before they enter the State by inspector of the Federal Bureau of Animal Industry or by inspector of State of Kansas. Cattle for stocker or feeding purposes admitted on permit by complying with Bureau of Animal Industry's requirements to move interstate. Cities and towns allowed to pass ordinances compelling tuberculin test of all dairy cows. All reactors slaughtered under Federal inspection. Owners of tested herds listed in "Kansas Blue Book." Kansas had an appropriation of \$10,000 for 1916, but that was exhausted. They paid one-half value of condemned animals while the fund lasted.

KENTUCKY.

Law creates live-stock sanitary board, and regulations provide that all cattle intended for dairy or breeding purposes imported shall be accompanied by certificate, including tuberculin test, showing that they are free from tuberculosis. Stockers and feeders need not necessarily be tested for tuberculosis before being brought in, but must be accompanied by certificate showing such cattle to be apparently free from tuberculosis. Calves under 6 months need not be tested to be imported, but if from tubercular dams, can not be brought into the State. Duty of any person suspecting tuberculosis in cattle to report the same to the State veterinarian. Any animal found to be tubercular shall be quarantined, isolated, or destroyed. May be killed either under inspection of State inspectors or at market under inspection of Federal inspectors. Any cow that reacts and is isolated or quarantined must be retested in not less than two or more than six months by a different veterinarian, and if again reacts shall be branded in the forehead by the letter "T," and sale for other than immediate slaughter is prohibited. Services of inspector shall be free to any farmer or owner of milk cow in testing for tuberculosis.

LOUISIANA.

All cattle brought into the State for the use of dairy or breeding purposes shall be free from tuberculosis, and the health certificate that accompanies them shall show that they have been tested with tuberculin. No test required for calves under 6 months, but calves from tubercular cows shall be rejected. Shipment for grazing and feeding purposes permitted without test on affidavits showing cattle are intended for that purpose. All cattle sold at public stock yards for dairy or breeding purposes shall be officially tested with tuberculin and they shall be ear tagged. All veterinarians must report to live-stock sanitary board all cattle tested and whether they pass the test or react. Tuberculin is furnished free to veterinarians, and they shall apply ear tags to the reacting animals.

MAINE.

Law creates live-stock sanitary commissioner. Law provides that all persons selling pure-blood cattle or cattle represented as pure blood for breeding purposes shall before delivery make a report to the live-stock sanitary commissioner stating number of cattle sold, age, and sex and to whom sold, and such cattle shall be tested with tuberculin under direction of the live-stock sanitary commissioner, and the certificate given to the purchaser, calves under one year excepted. Law provides that no neat stock (calves, cows, steer, oxen, or bulls) or stags of any age shall be allowed to enter State of Maine, neither for dairying or breeding purposes nor for slaughter without a permit duly authorized by the live-stock sanitary commissioner. Such animals shall be tested within 30 days with tuberculin, regardless of any other test made, and shall be held in quarantine upon premises of owner until released by the live-stock sanitary commissioner. Cattle used for dairy and breeding purposes shown in competition for prizes at State agricultural shows shall be tested within 12 months. Maximum appraisal value for pure-bred cattle \$100 and \$75 for grade cattle.

MARYLAND.

Bulls, cows, and heifers 6 months old and over imported into the State must be accompanied by satisfactory certificate of health and tuberculin test chart showing cattle to have been in good health within 10 days of shipment, and that they have not been exposed to other contagious or infectious diseases; not to tuberculous animals since the date of the tuberculin test. Test must have been applied within three months of date of shipment, except where animal is from a "State accredited herd," then any time within 12 months. Apparently healthy calves under 6 months, certified not to have been exposed to tuberculous animals are not required to have the tuberculin test. Apparently healthy cattle may be shipped to the Union Stock Yards, Baltimore, without previous examination and test. All bulls, cows, and heifers above the age of 6 months will be examined and tuberculin tested at this point. Admitted under permit and quarantine where satisfactory test can not be given before shipment, and then must be tested before being released from quarantine. Regulations do not apply to cattle for immediate slaughter where such animals are to be slaughtered within five days of their arrival within the State. Some progress has been made by the bureau in cooperation with Maryland authorities in eradication of tuberculosis.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Neat cattle for dairy or breeding purposes, unless consigned to quarantine station, must be accompanied by a permit of the Massachusetts department of animal industry. Tuberculin test required if over

6 months of age, either by veterinarian where shipment originates or by agent of Massachusetts on arrival at destination. Quarantined until released by the department. Tuberculin test made of animals within the State made at owner's request. Where one animal in herd is found reactor, all of the herd must be tested. Provision for compensation to cattle owners for animals condemned as tuberculous.

MICHIGAN.

Law prohibits importation into the State of cattle for breeding or dairy purposes except when such cattle are accompanied by a certificate of inspection showing that at the time of inspection and within 60 days prior to shipment said cattle had been subject to tuberculin test and were free from tuberculosis. Commission has power to test herds where tuberculosis is suspected, and either place in quarantine the reactors or else have them slaughtered. Law provides the amount that shall be paid the owners where cattle are killed.

MINNESOTA.

Law provides that it is unlawful for any transportation company to bring into the State cattle for feeding, breeding, or dairy purposes unless such animals have been examined and found free from tuberculosis, and provides that in case of cattle over 6 months of age to be used for breeding or dairy purpose the nonexistence of tuberculosis shall have been determined by the tuberculin test within 30 days preceding such importation. Test shall not be demanded of cattle intended for exhibition at town, county, district, or State fairs. Law provides that every person who suspects contagious or infectious disease must report the same to board of health. Can condemn cattle found to react to tuberculin test and law provides method and amount of appraisal.

MISSISSIPPI.

Law creates the live stock sanitary board and provides that cattle imported for dairy and breeding purposes must be accompanied with a health certificate, including the tuberculin test.

Dr. Mohler note.—No arrangements have been made for tuberculosis cooperation work, but opinion of bureau that if additional funds were available State would cooperate.

MISSOURI.

Health certificate for dairy and breeding cattle, including tuberculin test required. If any animal in lot inspected is found tuberculous, the words "Exposed to tuberculosis on day of inspection" shall be written on the certificate of health of such animals as pass. Cattle for pasturing, feeding, or immediate slaughter admitted on permit from State veterinarian. Nearly all cities in State are passing and enforcing ordinances requiring annual tuberculin test on all dairy cattle. On the authority of Congressman HENSLEY, Missouri compensates for condemned animals up to \$40 for grades and \$200 for pure breeds.

MONTANA.

Cattle imported into the State for dairying, strictly pasture breeding, all pure breeds, and all bulls over 6 months of age must be accompanied by a tuberculin test chart. Cattle for feeding purpose or for slaughter where no inspection is maintained must be accompanied by a clinical health certificate. Where for slaughter the waybill must be marked "For immediate slaughter." If cattle originate in either New York or Wisconsin health certificate must be issued by inspector of United States Bureau of Animal Industry.

Dr. Mohler note.—Cooperation work inaugurated here July 1, 1917. State has several inspectors. Bureau can only furnish one.

NEBRASKA.

All pure-bred cattle imported into the State must be moved to destination in quarantine and held under the direction of the live-stock sanitary board for an official tuberculin test, to be applied at owner's expense, under the direction of the State live-stock sanitary board, not less than 60 days after their arrival. All health certificates accompanying shipments of pure-bred cattle must be immediately forwarded to the State live-stock sanitary board upon arrival at destination. Cattle for dairy and breeding purposes over 6 months old must be accompanied with health certificates, including tuberculin test. For feeding, grazing, and range purposes permit from deputy State veterinarian without tuberculin test. If not accompanied by health certificate, cattle will be inspected at destination at owner's expense. For exhibition purposes cattle admitted on permit from deputy State veterinarian without tuberculin test, but must be accompanied with proper health certificate, and if they remain three months or more in State must submit to tuberculin test. Cattle for immediate slaughter admitted without inspection. Cattle from New York or Illinois must have health certificate, including tuberculin test, issued by inspector of United States Bureau of Animal Industry. At annual meeting of organization at Lincoln declared in favor of State appropriation to cooperate with United States where tuberculosis is suspected in excess, as shown on inspection for shipment or at packing house; balance of herd tested and owner advised to send reactors to slaughter within 15 days. If not complied with, herd quarantined. Many towns have ordinances compelling tuberculin test of dairy cows.

NEVADA.

Cattle imported for dairy or breeding purposes must be accompanied by health certificate, including tuberculin test certificate, except range cattle transferred from the ranges of other States to the ranges of Nevada. In lieu of certificate of inspection owner must mail a statement giving the origin and destination of shipment and number of bulls, cows, steers, and calves included in the same.

MOHLER NOTE.—Little done here, but authorities indicated a willingness to cooperate as to accredited herds and otherwise.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

All cattle over 6 months of age shall be tuberculin tested prior to entering the State. All tests must be approved by live-stock sanitary official in State where cattle are tested and permit issues upon receipt of the test charts. Destroy immediately, without remuneration for the owner, all reacting cattle that may be detected by retest or otherwise from irregular interstate shipments. Domestic herds tested upon suspicion of tuberculosis at expense of State at owner's request and promise to improve sanitary conditions. Owners of cattle killed after test upon order of commissioner, and which have been in State three months, receive 50 per cent of value, but not to exceed \$100. Cattle also killed without payment from the State by allowing owner all money received from the products. Any cattle not for slaughter must be marked by ear tag or button with capital letter "T" on the same.

NEW JERSEY.

Law vests powers in control of tuberculosis among animals in department of agriculture. Health certificate required for dairy and breeding cattle, including tuberculin test. Law authorizes importation of cattle into State without requiring tuberculin test if accredited by State from which imported. State has recently organized a bureau of animal industry, which will have supervision over the eradication and control of contagious and infectious diseases.

Dr. MOHLER NOTE.—Recently organized bureau of animal industry under Dr. McNeill, former employee of United States bureau. Believed that cooperative eradication work can be arranged for.

NEW MEXICO.

Dairy cattle or cattle intended for the breeding of dairy cattle imported into State must be accompanied by health certificate, including tuberculin test.

NEW YORK.

Neat cattle for dairy or breeding purposes must be accompanied by certificate of health showing satisfactory tuberculin-test record. If not so accompanied, must be held in quarantine at destination within State until duly examined by representative of State department of agriculture and released. Law authorizes quarantine of infected animals and commercial use of milk or use for breeding under regulation of commissioner of agriculture, and requires segregation of young immediately after birth.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Health certificate, including certificate of tuberculin test, required for imported cattle when intended for breeding or dairy purposes.

NORTH DAKOTA.

Health certificate for all cattle imported. Cattle over 6 months of age that can be used for dairy or breeding purposes must be accompanied by tuberculin-test chart health certificate. Test and inspection must be made within 30 days of shipment. Shipments from New York, Wisconsin, and South St. Paul, Minn., must have certificate signed by inspector of the United States Bureau of Animal Industry. The live stock sanitary board authorized to test domestic herds for tuberculosis at the request of owners where owner agrees to requirements in regard to reacting cattle and sanitary conditions of rest of herd. Law provides method of appraisal, and maximum amount paid owner when cattle are ordered killed. All persons selling pure-bred cattle or cattle represented to be pure bred, for any purpose except slaughter, within the State shall report the same before delivery to the State live stock sanitary board and such cattle shall be tested with tuberculin, and if found free from disease a certificate shall be issued to the owner to be delivered to the purchaser. This shall not be required of animals under 6 months of age.

OHIO.

Health certificate, including tuberculin test, required for dairy and breeding cattle 6 months of age and over. Tuberculin test must be made within six weeks prior to the importation of cattle into the State.

OKLAHOMA.

Health certificate, including tuberculin test, required to import cattle for dairy or breeding purposes.

OREGON.

Dairy and breeding cattle, except for immediate slaughter, must be accompanied with health certificate, including tuberculin test. All cattle, excepting settlers' and homesteaders' effects, imported from east of Mississippi River and north of Tennessee and North Carolina, must first receive written permit from State veterinarian. Cattle originating in New York, Wisconsin, or South Dakota must be tuberculin tested by Federal veterinarian.

Dr. MOHLER NOTE.—Oregon well organized for carrying on eradication work. Only one United States inspector in that State.

PENNSYLVANIA.

The law provides that each bovine animal over 6 months old imported into the State shall have health certificate and tuberculin-test chart showing that the examination and tuberculin test has been carried out in manner approved by the State veterinarian of Pennsylvania. Does not apply to animals for immediate slaughter, and animals for exhibition purposes are admitted on permit from State veterinarian. Importation of cattle permitted without health certificate or chart under supervision of State veterinarian and under quarantine until examined and tested by representative of live stock sanitary board and released. Examination and test at the expense of State. Unlawful for any person to sell for dairy or breeding purposes any domestic animals brought into the State for immediate slaughter or to use or permit to be used any such animals for dairy or breeding purposes. State live stock sanitary board given power to suppress, control, and eradicate dangerous, contagious, and infectious diseases among domestic animals, and they have the right to examine and test suspected animals, and it is the duty of local veterinarian to report such diseases. Have the right to order diseased cattle killed, and maximum amount to be paid owner fixed by law. Without express permission of board, it is unlawful for any person to sell, give away, or allow to stray any animal that has reacted to tuberculin test. Tuberculous animals may be branded by board. Milk as food for animals from reacting cows must be sterilized. Skimmed milk or separator slop must be pasteurized by creamery before returning for feeding purposes for animals.

RHODE ISLAND.

For importation of cattle, a physical examination required. If cattle suspicious, tuberculin test ordered by cattle commissioner.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Health certificate required for all cattle imported, except for immediate slaughter. Tuberculin test for dairy and breeding cattle over 6 months old. Under a State law, all cattle that react under a test by the State veterinarian are paid for in part by the State. The amount is 40 per cent of the value.

Dr. MOHLER NOTE.—Bureau's understanding that trustees Clemson College will endorse bill at next legislature asking appropriation for cooperative tuberculosis eradication work.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

For importation of all cattle health certificate is required. Bulls and female cattle over 6 months old must be accompanied by a certificate showing that they have passed the tuberculin test within 30 days of date of shipment. If evidence furnished that cows and heifers are strictly range cattle and will not be used for dairy or domestic purposes, and that they originate in Arizona, New Mexico, Texas, Utah, Colorado, Montana, Wyoming, or Nevada or in Kansas or Nebraska west of the one hundredth meridian permit may be issued to admit without tuber-

culin test. May be brought in under quarantine and kept in quarantine until tested and released. From New York State certificate must be issued by Federal inspector. Cattle from officially accredited herds admitted without tuberculin-test chart. Western South Dakota and Nebraska considered free range and no test required for cows and heifers for feeding. Duty of live-stock sanitary board to cause to be tested for tuberculosis any cow or cows in a dairy herd from which milk is sold for human consumption when requested to do so by three or more patrons and when it believes such test advisable and necessary. When cattle are adjudged affected with tuberculosis and ordered killed they are appraised and paid for by State at one-half appraised value not to exceed \$50; payment does not apply where animals react within one year after being brought into the State.

TENNESSEE.

Importation of dairy cows and meat cattle for breeding purposes is prohibited by law except in cases where they are accompanied by certificate from competent inspector and certificate shall show that cattle have been examined and subjected to the tuberculin test and are free from disease. May come in under quarantine and remain in quarantine until examined and tested by State inspectors and released. Within the State no person shall deliver for transportation or receive for transportation or remove from premises where they are located any cattle or swine affected with tuberculosis as disclosed by physical examination or by tuberculin test. Control within the State largely under the provision to control and eradicate contagious and infectious diseases under which tuberculous cattle may be quarantined or ordered killed. Subcutaneous test the only test recognized and the requirements of the test given in the regulations. Veterinarians making test shall brand reactors with letter "T" on right jaw and report to county health officer who shall isolate and place in quarantine all branded reacting animals until they are disposed of according to law by appraisal and slaughter. Maximum valuation for grade cow, \$25; pure bred, \$100.

TEXAS.

All cattle imported must be accompanied by health certificate and all cattle for dairy and breeding purposes over 6 months old and cattle for exhibition must have tuberculin-test chart showing test within at least 60 days prior to time cattle enter the State. Can use either subcutaneous or intradermal test. Live stock for exhibition or show purposes must be tuberculin tested within 60 days of entry at show or exhibition unless they belong to a State accredited herd. Where tuberculosis or exposure thereto is suspected by live-stock sanitary commission they have the power to quarantine the premises and all live stock thereon and subject the same to the tuberculin test. All cattle that show positive reaction shall be removed from herd and quarantined. Cattle exposed subject to second test at end of six months but not kept in strict quarantine. All cattle quarantined on account of tuberculosis may be removed for immediate slaughter on permit of live-stock sanitary commission. Have established State accredited herds where owner lists all of his cattle and guarantees to have all tuberculin tested annually.

UTAH.

No cattle or swine affected with tuberculosis, as disclosed by a physical examination, tuberculin test, or by any other means shall be imported into the State. Bulls, work oxen, or female cattle over 6 months old intended for breeding or dairy purposes other than branded range stock must have health certificate and tuberculin-test chart showing that cattle have been examined and subjected to the tuberculin test within 40 days prior to date of shipment. Cattle for dairy or breeding purposes may be shipped into the State without tuberculosis-test chart if from accredited tuberculosis-free herd which has been tested not longer than nine months of date of shipment. Tuberculin-test chart not required of branded range bulls for breeding purposes or range. Branded range cattle shall be accompanied by health certificate. Every person who sells milk to a dairy and every person engaged in dairy business in the State shall cause every cow milked by him to be examined and subjected to the tuberculin test. Done under direction of State inspector or inspectors of United States Bureau of Animal Industry without charge. Owner, when notified, shall have cattle in barn and temperature taken at 3, 5, and 8 p. m., and injection at 9 p. m., and on following day temperatures at 7, 8, 11 a. m., and 1 and 3 p. m. Chart mailed at once to State board. Healthy cattle passing tuberculin test shall be tagged in lower right ear with metal ear label bearing a consecutive number and "Utah passed." When cattle found suspicious they shall be held for a retest after a period of not less than 40 days and shall be tagged in lower left ear with a metal ear label bearing a consecutive number and "Utah reacted." Cattle reacting to the tuberculin test shall be tagged in lower left ear with metal label bearing consecutive number and "Utah reacted," with a bangle or pendant attached bearing "Condemned." When cattle are condemned they shall be immediately appraised and slaughtered in establishment having Government meat inspection or under supervision of State inspector and result of post mortem recorded on back of tuberculin-test chart. State to pay not more than \$1,000 on any claim.

VERMONT.

Cattle must be accompanied by a permit from Vermont live-stock commissioner specifying number in shipment and stating origin of shipment and destination within Vermont.

VIRGINIA.

Health certificate for dairy and breeding cattle including tuberculin test made within the preceding four months. There has very recently been some progress in cooperative work between bureau and Virginia. See statement of Dr. Kisman, hearings January 10, Committee on Agriculture.

WASHINGTON.

Tuberculin test for dairy and breeding cattle and special permit from commissioner of agriculture.

Dr. Mohler note—Work now in progress receiving excellent support of people. Opinion good results will follow if funds are provided.

WEST VIRGINIA.

All domestic animals brought into State must have health certificate showing free from contagious diseases at examination within 30 days prior, or can be brought in under quarantine. There shall be provided for each bovine animal over 6 months old that has been used or is to be used for dairy or breeding purposes a health certificate and tuberculin test chart, except animals from officially accredited herds may be admitted without tuberculin test chart. Does not apply to animals brought in for immediate slaughter or for temporary exhibition purposes. No apparently healthy bull or heifer under 6 months shall be subjected to tuberculin test. May be brought in under quarantine and remain so until tested and released. Unlawful to sell for dairy or breeding pur-

poses any domestic animal brought into the State for immediate slaughter or to use or to permit to be used any such animal for dairy or breeding purposes. The law provides that commissioner of agriculture or agents shall possess authority to test with tuberculin any bovine animal kept within the State. Shall be applied at such times as may be designated by commissioner as necessary in the control and eradication of bovine tuberculosis, and all cows whose milk is sold for human consumption or manufacture and all uncastrated beef animals shall be tested as far as may be possible. Reactors shall be branded on right side of neck with letter "T" unless owner elects to keep animal in quarantine for eight weeks, when animal shall be tested again at owner's expense, and if reacts again it shall be branded. All bovine animals in State deemed tuberculous either by physical examination or tuberculin test shall be slaughtered within a time and at a place designated by the commissioner with appraisal five days previous to date of slaughter. If owner desires to receive indemnity, required to execute agreement that he will thoroughly clean and disinfect all premises, have entire herd tested with tuberculin at such times as commissioner may designate nor to admit to his herd untested cattle and agreement to run two years. Maximum amount of appraisal \$75 for pure bred and \$50 for grade or nonregistered. Owner shall be furnished with copy of tuberculin test chart and report of postmortem examination.

WISCONSIN.

Importation of cattle into the State for other purposes than to be slaughtered within 10 days subsequent to such importation is prohibited, except when such cattle are accompanied by a certificate of inspection showing tuberculin test within 6 months prior to shipment, or cattle may be shipped in quarantine and be tested at first point of destination at expense of owner. Have plans within State for accredited herds and carry on tuberculin tests to a large extent. Condemned animals to be appraised and one-half paid by State, but in no event shall amount paid exceed \$100.

WYOMING.

Neat cattle, health certificate. All dairy cattle, bulls, and female cattle, registered or pure bred, over 6 months old, health certificate including tuberculin test. No action as to establishing accredited herds. No work by the bureau.

And I would ask the gentlemen who are here to look over this abstract, because I have endeavored to give a fair statement of what the activities and legislation of the various States have been in this line. Now, inaccuracies may arise, but do not be too critical, although I spent a good deal of time in securing this and in compiling it.

Inaccuracies arising from changes recently made, if any have been so made, or from lack of complete statement on the part of corresponding State officer may be found in this abstract. All that I expect is that it will be a general basis for understanding the present situation as it is through the several States and the country at large.

A number of generalized facts can be deduced from the foregoing abstract.

The tuberculin test is used in 47 out of the 48 States as a prerequisite for admission of dairy or breeding animals.

Twenty States provide for the public slaughter of animals where tuberculosis has become generalized in the system. The States are as follows: Alabama, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, West Virginia, and Wisconsin.

All of these except Alabama, Florida, Georgia, and Kentucky provide for compensation, the measure, of course, differing in the different States. The four States last named, I assume, possibly not warrantably, that the county or State which authorizes the forced slaughter would recognize or be compelled to recognize a claim for actual damage suffered by the owner.

Mr. HENSLEY. Missouri can be included, I will say to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. SLOAN. In the matter of payment?

Mr. HENSLEY. In the matter of payment, unless that law was repealed by the last legislature.

Mr. SLOAN. The information coming from your State did not include that, because I looked for it carefully. I am glad the gentleman has made the statement. I will put it in my abstract. I will say that the Congressman states it. My information from the State of Missouri did not include it; neither did it exclude it in terms.

The following States recognize what is known as accredited herds: Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Maryland, Texas, and West Virginia.

An accredited herd means a herd containing one or more pure-bred animals, the remainder being either pure bred or grades which have been properly tested, found free of tuberculosis, and also kept under such conditions as to not probably contract the disease.

It is quite possible that within the last few months other States, under direction of their live-stock authorities, have adopted the accredited herd system. I suggest this because there has been a great activity among the live stock.

I mention the following facts not directly toward the two items of appropriation but as a matter of importance for our consideration, a lesson that we can draw from the present war.

I took occasion recently to examine the statistics of cattle in the South at two important epochs:

First, 1860 to 1870.

Second, 1900 to 1910.

In 1860 the total number of cattle in the United States was 28,967,028. Of these, 12,019,156 were in the 11 Southern States. In the rest of the country there were 16,857,872.

War had its inevitable effect. Five years after its close, notwithstanding the energies of reconstruction North and South, there were only 28,074,582 head of cattle in the United States. There were in the 11 States only 9,255,956, a decrease of 2,763,200. The cattle and losses were distributed as appear in the following table:

Total cattle in United States for 1860..... 28,967,028
Total cattle for 1870..... 28,074,582

	1870	1860	Loss.
Alabama.....	500,206	813,604	313,518
Arkansas.....	379,023	590,530	191,507
Florida.....	465,896	453,451	13,445
Georgia.....	801,067	1,208,952	400,285
Louisiana.....	593,138	593,138	203,774
Mississippi.....	351,247	736,730	155,543
North Carolina.....	618,283	693,810	75,547
South Carolina.....	289,207	506,776	217,569
Tennessee.....	682,218	821,244	141,026
Texas.....	3,960,158	4,397,414	407,256
Virginia.....	573,152	1,188,002	614,850
Total.....	9,255,956	12,019,156	2,763,200

1910. All cattle (United States)..... 61,803,866
1900. All cattle (United States)..... 67,719,418

	1910	1900
Alabama.....	932,428	799,734
Arkansas.....	1,028,071	894,535
Florida.....	845,183	751,261
Georgia.....	1,080,316	899,491
Louisiana.....	804,795	670,285
Mississippi.....	1,012,632	873,356
North Carolina.....	700,861	624,518
South Carolina.....	389,882	342,898
Tennessee.....	996,523	912,183
Texas.....	6,934,586	9,428,196
Virginia.....	859,067	825,512
Total.....	15,581,355	17,021,979

Gain in all except Texas. Loss in Texas due to sale of range for agricultural purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. How much time does the gentleman wish?

Mr. SLOAN. I can finish in 20 minutes.

Mr. HAUGEN. I will yield to the gentleman 10 minutes.

Mr. SLOAN. It took more than 12 years after the war before the number of cattle before the war was equalled in the country at large. At the close of the war the number of cattle in the Northern States was less than at its beginning. Authorities throughout the country on this problem state that the accredited herd enterprise is coming into general favor. Dr. Kiernan, having charge of the tuberculosis section of the Bureau of Animal Industry, at the hearings stated:

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. What do you mean by accrediting the herd?

Dr. Kiernan. Herds that are found free. The way it developed that this plan was adopted, it requires that when herds of cattle have been subjected to two annual or three semiannual tuberculin tests and found free from the disease, that they would be placed upon either the State accredited herd list or the United States accredited herd list. That means that whenever an owner of any of those herds of cattle desired to ship an animal interstate it would be unnecessary for him to send out and get a veterinarian to come in and test an individual animal that he might desire to ship interstate. A certificate could then be issued for any animal in that herd to be shipped interstate, without a further tuberculin test, good for a period of one year.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Did this relate only to pure-bred cattle that you speak of?

Dr. Kiernan. Well, here is the definition of the pure-bred herd of cattle, to be classed under the accredited herd list, any herd containing one or more pure-bred animals. That plan was adopted and has been sent out to officials of the various States for their indorsement, and we have already received favorable replies from 12 or 15 States.

Mr. RUBEY. Do you mean then, when you say one or more pure-bred animals, that if a herd composed of 20 animals contains one or two pure-bred animals that that whole herd will receive a certificate?

Dr. Kiernan. Yes, sir.

Mr. SLOAN. As to being clear of tuberculosis.

While the Live-Stock Sanitary Association of the United States, as well as the various national breeding associations, were in convention at Chicago early in December of 1917, the Breeders' Gazette, one of the greatest publications of its class in the world, published an editorial, a part of which is as follows:

A CAMPAIGN AGAINST TUBERCULOSIS.

A tied-up trade is undoubtedly bound to follow neglect on the part of the breeders to set seriously to work to clean their herds of tuberculosis. Some years ago the plan of State accredited herds was presented to them and a considerable number in some States, especially those which encourage a clean-up by means of compensation, are acquiring lists of disease-free herds. In some States the movement has been slow, as breeders fear the possible loss. At the meeting of the United States Live Stock Association in Chicago this week the Bureau of Animal Industry submitted a tentative plan for accredited herds and a committee of that association studied it. At a dinner given by the Chicago Live Stock Exchange at the Saddle and Sirloln Club on Monday night of this week a large number of sanitary officials and veterinarians met representatives of a half dozen cattle registry associations in conference on this subject. A committee of breeders was named to consider the proposed plan, together with the committee of sanitary authorities.

Three factors are essential to a successful campaign against tuberculosis: First, the problem must be admitted to be a cow question, not a baby question. It is fundamentally an economic question. Second, reasonable compensation must be granted for reactors which are slaughtered or segregated. Third, Federal and State aid and cooperation must be liberally extended. It is not a local or a State problem. It is interstate, it is Nation-wide.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Whose statement is that?

Mr. SLOAN. It is the statement of the Breeders' Gazette, an editorial.

Mr. LINTHICUM. He said that it must not be considered a baby question but an economic question?

Mr. SLOAN. He says it must be confined to that. I do not agree with the proposition.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Neither do I.

Mr. SLOAN. Because they are both important, but the economic feature is the one I am arguing. I do not detract in any way from the large question, to wit, the sanitary, of which I know the gentleman from Maryland is champion.

On December 4, 1917, I received a telegram, a copy of which is as follows:

UNION STOCK YARDS, ILL., December 4, 1917.

HON. CHARLES H. SLOAN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

At a joint conference of live-stock breeders, State veterinarians, and members of this exchange House bill No. 6188, making an appropriation of \$1,000,000 for the control of tuberculosis in live stock, was unanimously approved and its passage recommended.

THE CHICAGO LIVE STOCK EXCHANGE,
By E. C. BROWN, President.

To indicate what the live-stock sanitary authorities, as well as the various live-stock associations, are doing in Nebraska, I submit the following telegram recently received:

LINCOLN, NEBR., January 18, 1918.

HON. CHARLES H. SLOAN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Resolutions passed by the Nebraska Improved Live Stock Breeders' Association, Lincoln, Nebr., January 17, 1918:

"Whereas the disease, bovine tuberculosis, is causing a loss of approximately \$30,000,000 annually in the United States and is continually becoming a greater menace to the live-stock industry; and

"Whereas it allowed to continue its ravages the production of meat and milk products will be seriously hindered, to the detriment of all classes and to the cause for which we are fighting: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Nebraska Improved Live Stock Breeders' Association in convention assembled at Lincoln, Nebr., January 17, 1918, That we recommend aggressive measures be taken by the Federal Government and various States to eradicate this disease, and that liberal appropriation be made for the purpose. We heartily indorse the provisions of the bill now pending in Congress, introduced by Congressman SLOAN, which provides for an appropriation of \$1,000,000 annually for the eradication of tuberculosis, and we urge the Legislature of Nebraska at the next general session to appropriate a liberal fund with which to cooperate with the Federal Government on an equal basis in the payment of indemnities and expenses incidental to making of tuberculin tests in this State; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to Secretary Houston of the United States Department of Agriculture, to the Nebraska Members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, and to the governor of the State of Nebraska, with request that the substances of these resolutions be incorporated in his message to the next legislature."

CHAS. GRAFF, President.
H. J. GRAMLICH, Secretary.

The following resolution was passed by the Nebraska Dairy-men's Association January 18, 1918:

Whereas the disease, bovine tuberculosis, is causing heavy annual losses in the dairy industry of the United States, and is seriously interfering with the proper development of our dairy herds and the production of milk products: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Nebraska State Dairy-men's Association in convention assembled at Lincoln, Nebr., January 18, 1918, That we heartily indorse the Sloan bill now pending in Congress, which provides for an appropriation of \$1,000,000 for the eradication of this disease by the Bureau of Animal Industry in cooperation with the various States.

D. H. FRANDSEN.
A. M. TEMPLE.
H. C. YOUNG.

There were in the United States in 1900, 67,719,410 head of cattle. In 1910, according to the census, there were only 61,803,866. According to present estimate we have now about 63,500,000. All of these are subject to tuberculosis. Of course it is more generally prevalent in the North than in the South,

where the climate is more equable and the cattle uniformly live in the open.

This problem should appeal especially to Members who live in the cattle-tick region as well as to those who live above that latitude. That section has been making important strides in rebuilding their live-stock industries. In every State there are many who note the ravages of the boll weevil and at the same time have noticed how the Orient is beginning to cultivate and produce American cotton. They see that the one great crop, cotton, will not maintain their present station nor aid them in that progress for which their climate, soil, and other natural resources equip them. The South can become a successful competitor of the North in the production of meat foods. If proper progress is to be made, the herds which are being built up must be kept clear of tuberculosis. It can only be kept out by a nation-wide cleansing of the herds, especially those from whose ranks must come the breeding factors. Figuring in ultimate results, the people of the Southland have as much at stake in this enterprise as we of the North.

The work proposed is one of man size and is for the hour. It is not a problem for to-morrow. Since the Spanish-American War the Spanish word "manana" has in too many important considerations been Americanized. Let not the Department of Agriculture or the American Congress adopt it. I would like to have you read the statement of Dr. Mohler. It is hopeful, militant, and confident that this problem, if attacked in the way it should be, tuberculosis can be eradicated.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question right there?

Mr. SLOAN. Certainly.

Mr. TILSON. In a word, what does the gentleman say shall be the plan of campaign? Shall it be intensive in one State, so as to remove it entirely from that State, and then move on to another State, or is it to be a general campaign everywhere all at once?

Mr. SLOAN. It can not all be done at once. It must be taken up by separate areas. I shall try to explain here. Wherever a State will cooperate with the Federal Government, then the State and the owners will proceed to clear up a selected area, just as they are proceeding to do now with hog cholera so effectively. As they clear up an area, other areas will be taken hold of, multiplied, and expanded, and finally the campaign will become State wide and afterwards Nation wide. Dr. Mohler has well stated the plan.

Mr. TILSON. Meanwhile not permitting other cattle from the outside to come in—other cattle that might be diseased?

Mr. SLOAN. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. If the gentleman will permit, if we can not get more than \$250,000, it must necessarily be taken up piecemeal?

Mr. SLOAN. Yes. Dr. Mohler believes that if the solution of this problem is properly gone about it will take \$1,000,000 for 1919. I have talked with him at least twice upon this subject and once quite recently.

I have made his statement a part of my remarks. He believes that if this problem is gone about it will take \$1,000,000 for 1919. His statement fits well with the demand that is being made for increased production of meat. Appeals are being made by our food controller that on certain days we not eat meat. I approve it. Our boys will need it in the trenches. Meat and white bread constitute the battle food of our Army, whom we believe when properly equipped and maintained, man for man, are the best fighters in the world. [Applause.] Let us stint to save. Let us also strain to produce.

Beef production at the present moment is a losing venture. I hope it may improve. The Department of Agriculture appeals to the patriotism of feeders to buy and feed long, that every beef and swine life may produce a maximum of meat.

I received through the mail a few days ago the following figures from an experienced and extensive cattle feeder who had had his ups and downs in that precarious business.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLOAN. Certainly.

Mr. JUUL. Why do you say that meat or beef production is a losing venture?

Mr. SLOAN. Because it is at this particular time. I shall submit the figures here.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. SLOAN. Yes.

Mr. FESS. Is the falling off in the production of live stock due, in a great degree, to these elements that destroy, or are we not producing as much as heretofore?

Mr. SLOAN. Destruction by diseases is a large factor. We are, since 1910, slightly increasing our cattle, and the hog census

showed last April an increase of hogs. Beef production, however, is not right now, as the markets go, a money-making proposition. I can state that because I am fighting the proposition personally now, feeding high-priced corn to what is, comparatively speaking, low-priced beef. Of course there has been, on account of the war, a great demand, with rather fancy prices, for animals of much less than a maximum growth.

Mr. JUUL. I do not want to take up the gentleman's time, but I suppose the gentleman means it is not as paying a venture as farming in other lines might be. The gentleman does not mean to say that a man who is producing meat to-day is losing money in producing it?

Mr. SLOAN. The man who is doing what the Government asks—putting the maximum amount of beef on the bovine life—is losing money now.

Mr. FESS. Would the gentleman care to say what proportion of our energy is going into conserving what we have, rather than increasing the number? Or is the gentleman ready to make a statement in that regard?

Mr. SLOAN. I could not make a good answer to that very pertinent question within my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have 10 minutes.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 10 minutes.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman 10 minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska is recognized for 10 minutes more.

Mr. SLOAN. I would like to say in response to the question propounded by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] that we are devoting a great deal of energy to conserving meat. This measure is for that purpose. We are saving meat. That has an effect on the price of the matured beef animal. Immature animals are relatively higher than they used to be; the matured animals are cheaper. Yet that is just what the Government is appealing for, so that in the end the maximum number of pounds may be produced from the number of cattle we have. Feeders were purchased by the cattlemen at an extraordinarily high price. The figures you will find here given by an old feeder. They illustrate the case fairly well. The figures are presented by Hon. C. E. Adams, of Omaha. I read:

20 feeders, average weight 1,000 pounds, at 9 cents per hundredweight	Total cost.
75 bushels corn per head for 6 months' feed, 1,500 bushels, at \$1.50 per bushel	\$1,800.00
25 tons of hay, at \$15 per ton	2,250.00
Labor and care per day, \$1.33 $\frac{1}{3}$, for 180 days	375.00
Losses from accident or natural causes	240.00
Interest on the investment, 6 months at 7 per cent	90.00
	162.00
Total cost	4,917.00
Maximum gain on 20 head, at 400 per head, 6 months, is 5,000 pounds, added to the original weight, 28,000; market value of prime beef, to-day's market, \$12 per hundredweight	3,360.00
Gain on hogs following cattle, 6 months, 5,000 pounds, at \$16 per hundredweight	800.00
Total receipts from sale	4,160.00
Loss to balance account	757.00
Total	4,917.00

It is somewhat different with pork and hogs. Our hog business has been going along all right. But if this Government had not done what it did do in regard to hog cholera we would have had 25 per cent less pork than we have at this time, and the price would be higher to those who have to consume it.

He makes some very appropriate remarks calling attention to the Government having provided in many cases for increase of wages, practically guaranteed transportation earnings, guaranteed good prices for fuel and wheat, that it would be proper to do something of the kind for the beef producer, whom he now figures is working at a loss. Here is an opportunity to aid him to reduce his hazard.

Men who go into hazardous business, where loss appears as frequent as gain, desire to eliminate every possible factor of hazard or loss. One of the large reasons why 8 and 10 years ago many farmers refused to produce swine was because the cholera would come along and destroy their herds. The Government and States took hold of this problem some five or six years ago, and now it is within the power of every swine owner to immunize his hogs, or at least reduce their loss to an inconsiderable minimum. Talk about preparedness!

One of the best pieces of preparedness that this Government has accomplished was in attacking hog cholera, the result of which finds us undoubtedly with 25 per cent more pork in the

United States than we would have had had the Government not taken hold of the problem.

If the Government would have the cattle owner breed to his capacity and keep his animals till maturity in order that the largest results may follow, every energy of the Government should be exercised to prevent his loss.

There is perhaps a still larger consideration affecting the economic side of this question than any I have detailed, and that is what America will have opportunity to do and which it can do for the world. A hurried reference to conditions following our own Civil War applies not only to the colossal war now being fought but to every war that has ever been waged between organized governments.

The keeper of herds from early times have been looked upon with more favor than the tillers of the soil. It was so between Abel and Cain. For this there are some religious reasons. There are reasons based upon turning the fruits of the soil into concentrated form for the sustenance of man. This form does not terminate growth when summer's burning sun gives way to winter's duller orb. There is the more important reason that while fruits of the soil must be carried wherever man would wander, the flocks and herds carry their own weights and the other burdens of man. But more particularly and to the point are the flocks and herds the source and support of soil fertility.

A searching glance of a map covering southeastern Europe, southwestern Asia, and northeastern Africa, coupled with a brief historical survey of that region centered around the cradle of the race, must lead one to consider why no vigorous civilization of the ancient days survive. Why are the peoples all subservient to other powers? Why the decrease of forestry? Why do the rivers carry less waters to the seas? Why is commerce decadent? Why the diminished plains and valleys of plenty? Why the multiplication in number and the extensive increases of desert areas? Why so much sand and so little loam? Many causes familiar to students of history there are but I shall emphasize but one. The history of that section is largely a recital of its wars. Canaan and Moab, Assyria and Babylon, Syria and Persia, Turkey and Egypt, each have sent over some of the others their battling and destructive hosts. The flocks and herds of the defeated have been despoiled while those of the victorious were not augmented. With the alternating tide of battle there was reduction and often destruction of sheep and cattle.

Without the herds and flocks the deserts charging with sand-laden winds invaded fertile valleys and subdued productive plains. In this day travelers passing through that section of the earth eagerly inquire how far to the next oasis or river. In that ancient day the wayfarer or the fugitive inquired what distance to the desert.

Over in Europe they are destroying millions of human beings in battle and elsewhere. But great as is the human waste I am convinced that, relatively speaking, there is a much greater reduction of food animals.

The lesson of the destroyed herds of the Orient is patent to all European countries. When peace arrives their representatives will be coming to this country to obtain factors for rebuilding their herds. They will view the animals as they appear and will study their pedigrees for desirable strains of blood. But while investigating these they will also consult with care the health of the animals considered for shipment to Europe. Then will appear large profits to the American producer and saving to the consumer, combined with advantage to a hungry world seeking to provide for itself that food for which the human system throughout all the ages has craved—namely, beef. [Applause.]

Mr. LEE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. YOUNG].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, in dealing with this, the annual appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture, we are dealing with items that touch agriculture in all of its phases, and every phase of agriculture has its peculiar troubles. One section of the country, by reason of climatic conditions, is confronted with its peculiar troubles. Another section of the country, by reason of its peculiar climatic conditions, has its particular troubles. In the forests in some sections of the country we have one trouble; in the prairies of another section we have another trouble, and so far as the Committee on Agriculture is concerned, a committee in which politics does not enter, we, representing the different sections of the country and knowing the troubles confronting agriculture in the different sections of the country from which we come, undertake as best we can, with the expert information given us by our department and with the knowledge peculiar to each of us, to deal fairly with every trouble, from

whatever section that trouble may come, and to legislate in order that the great whole may be taken care of.

Now, the distinguished gentleman [Mr. SLOAN] who has just discussed at some length one of the great troubles, tuberculosis, that confront the live-stock industry of this country will not find any quarrel with me in his effort to eradicate that trouble. It is a trouble not peculiar to live stock. It reaches into the human family and it has been combated all these ages as best it can be combated, and personally I am not averse to doing anything that can be done that would help to eliminate tuberculosis from cattle in any section of the country.

Gentlemen who discuss the great appropriations that they want for this one item can not raise any quarrel with me, coming as I do from a State that has 8,000,000 head of cattle to contribute to the food supply of the world. Our people are intensely interested in that industry. In the year just passed and in the year before that 144 counties of that great State did not have rainfall, and magnificent herds of cattle that men had devoted a lifetime to building up, great thoroughbred herds, had to be sacrificed, and 2,000,000 head of cattle have been swept away. That country is barren. It has had these troubles.

But while I am intensely interested in this great proposition, as a member of the Committee on Agriculture with a duty to perform, with other interests involved, and not one alone, where the whole subject of agriculture must be taken care of, personally interested as I am for my State with its millions of head of cattle, when there comes before the Committee on Agriculture expert information that that committee must rely upon in appropriating the people's money, I am bound to follow the advice and recommendation of those experts. And what do we do with reference to this item? We appropriate every dollar that these experts tell us they can legitimately expend in the next fiscal year, and we give them \$50,000 more than they estimated for in the original estimates as they came to our committee. When the direct question was asked of those experts, "How much can you spend on this item in the next fiscal year?" and they told us that \$250,000 was the outside amount that they could legitimately use, that committee with one voice gave them \$250,000.

Mr. SLOAN. Does the gentleman say that Dr. Mohler did not think that they could use effectively a great deal more than \$250,000?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. I do not think Dr. Mohler's testimony can dispute the statement of the expert that we had before the subcommittee and before the committee, when the direct question was put to him, and he had to answer it. We asked him, "How much can you legitimately use and expend?" and he said \$250,000, and we gave it to him.

Mr. SLOAN. That was Dr. Kiernan, was it not?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. I think that was the gentleman's name.

Mr. SLOAN. And that was what he thought could be used on the basis of the work that had been laid out.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Oh, the gentleman is not going to raise any quarrel with me on the amount, when we get the machinery to spend this amount properly. But there rests upon us the duty of taking care of the Treasury at the same time that we take care of these great interests. We have got to have organization, we have got to have system, we have got to have the machinery, and as a Committee on Agriculture we are dependent on the department down here to give us the information as to the machinery they have, and as to what they can legitimately spend. And when they tell us that they can use only so much money, I am not going to vote to appropriate a great sum that will be wasted, however great the end which we desire to accomplish. Now, I have had a little experience in these matters. In the South we have the tubercular trouble. It is not a sectional trouble confined to one section of the country alone. It is all over, and we are all interested in the meat supply of the Nation. But take the Texas fever, that comes by reason of the cattle tick. We have had a great fight on that in Texas, which is an empire within itself. We have spent a lot of money locally, and we had the help of the Federal Government trying to eradicate the pest which brought about this disease. Here would be one bunch of men spending money trying to eradicate it within a certain area, but here was a neighbor over on another great pasture who had not seen the importance of this proposition, and he did not clean up his pasture, and the result was that he overran his neighbor, and we had much lost motion and lost energy, and we wasted a great deal of money. Yet we knew the concrete proposition that we were after, which was to destroy the pest that cost us many millions of dollars each year. But after spending this money gradually from year to year, both locally and by the national authorities,

the time finally came around when the whole State was awakened to the proposition, and we did the sensible thing. Millions of dollars had been wasted, but when the proper time came, after a campaign of education had aroused everybody to the necessity of it, we did the sensible thing. Public sentiment being aroused, the legislature of that great State took up the matter of eliminating this pest, and by legislative enactment they said, "The Government has discovered for us a method by which the cattle tick can be eradicated, and we will no longer fool with this pest, but we will say by statutory enactment that Texas must be free of the cattle tick by 1921." So they made compulsory the dipping of the cattle, and by 1921 we will be free from that terrific trouble, and we will have won the fight and struggle that we have had for all these years. But we had to do it gradually. We spent this money, and we built up public sentiment. If the Government had given us millions from the Federal Treasury, and that had been supplemented by millions from our State and our localities, it is likely that it would not have been wisely spent at the time and most of it would have been wasted; but when we attack these great problems we must do it gradually. I believe in attacking them. You will not find me trying to throw anything in the way of the attack you are going to make on tuberculosis. But we have got to handle it as we do other great questions—appropriate the money as it can be legitimately used, make the fight consistently, and when you have organized your machinery and when you are getting it in motion, as they need more money, I am free to say to you, representing the great State of Texas with so many cattle as we have, my voice and my vote will be cast for every dollar that can be righteously expended on this one great subject. [Applause.]

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Sure.

Mr. ROBBINS. Before the gentleman leaves that subject, how much does he say can be advantageously expended in this tuberculosis campaign? The gentleman is on the committee.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. My judgment is the judgment based on the expert on whom we relied, who stated that he could use only \$250,000 in the next fiscal year.

Mr. ROBBINS. Is that the amount fixed in the bill?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Yes. We gave him every dollar he asked for, and \$50,000 more than was in the original estimate.

We have got other problems to deal with. Agriculture never was confronted with such serious conditions as it is to-day. I am sure that you gentlemen from the other States know your own local conditions. I know the conditions in my own great State.

It so happens that Texas is a great cotton and cattle State. It takes a great deal of labor in that State to produce cotton. We are short of labor. Our farmer boys, being patriotic when Old Glory called, went to the colors, leaving the farm, leaving the store. They have gone from us; they are not there to till the soil. That is true of other States in the Union. Not only are we confronted with the fact that the boys who have worked on the farm all these years have gone from us; other classes of labor, listening to the siren song of high wages in manufacturing centers of the country, have left agriculture by the thousands and the farm is stripped of that labor.

I do not know how it is in other States, but in Texas, a State 800 miles north and south and 800 miles east and west, we will be able to plow and be able to seed the crop, but where the labor is to come from to preserve the crop no man can undertake to say.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the present war has taken the boys from the farms in Texas?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. Does the gentleman mean the draft law?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Both draft and volunteer.

Mr. DENISON. The draft law gave to the President the authority to exempt labor on the farm.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Speaking for my State alone, I would like to see the color of the eyes of any President who could exempt a boy in Texas when Old Glory calls. [Applause.]

Mr. DENISON. I asked if the gentleman had reference to the draft law and he said he did.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. I will.

Mr. McKENZIE. The fact is, is it not, that a large number of the boys refused to ask for exemption?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. That is true all over the Nation; I do not speak of any particular section. I am speaking of the facts. I am not going to be drawn off into a discussion of the draft law. I voted for it and I would vote for it again, but

these are facts confronting the Nation, and not only the Nation but the world at large. I know, as every gentleman here must know, that in this war in Europe the trouble at this moment is the food supply, something to keep not only the soldiers supplied but the civil population as well. Our allies are looking to us to furnish that food supply.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. Has the Committee on Agriculture anything in view to relieve the shortage of farm labor at the present time?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. It has not been discussed by the committee as a committee, so far as I am advised. So far as I am personally concerned, using my wits as best I may, I do not know and I can not suggest where we are going to get the labor to save the crops of my State.

Mr. SNELL. I notice in a bulletin this morning that Mr. Post, Assistant Secretary of the Department of Labor, says that there is no necessity of importing common labor, that there is plenty in this country. I would like to know where that information comes from. In my district there is a shortage of labor on the farms, and farmers are complaining at the present time and want to know what Congress is going to do about it.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. I wish I could give the gentleman the information. I am speaking of my section because I know the facts. You gentlemen who have not seen cotton grow do not realize the great labor necessary in the production of cotton. In the saving of cotton after the crop is made you have to pick four or five locks of cotton from one boll, and it all has to be done by hand. In that way one has to gather 1,500 pounds of seed cotton to make a bale of 500 pounds of lint. Last year our crop fell down from 4,500,000 bales to 3,000,000 bales by reason of 144 counties having been swept by drought. Last year had it not been for the failure of the west and southwest Texas, northeast Texas that made a cotton crop could not have preserved it even in the first year of the war. While I am on that item I want to say that this is one item that affects every man in this country as well as in Europe. We are on a starvation basis for cotton supply of the world. For three years, instead of making 16,000,000 bales of cotton in this country, we have made 11,000,000 bales, and 11,500,000 bales, and the present year 10,500,000 bales. There have been three short cotton years, with a war which is demanding this great product.

Now, we must make it to clothe our people. We must save it to clothe our boys in the camp, and this labor question is one which confronts us and we have to deal with it.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. I will.

Mr. SNELL. Does the gentleman agree with the statement of Mr. Post in regard to the importation of labor?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. I will say that I do not know anything about where those figures or statements came from. I am stating what is true in my section of the country.

Mr. SNELL. I read that from the Official Bulletin issued to-day.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. The gentlemen from other States know what the conditions are in their sections of the country.

Mr. ROBBINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. For a question.

Mr. ROBBINS. I notice in this morning's paper a suggestion that we import from Porto Rico 110,000 laborers for use on the farms of the United States. What does the gentleman think of that proposition?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. I would not like to express an opinion on that proposition, because I have got to think about what is involved in it. I have heard suggestions made here and there of taking the boys out of this place and that place and putting them on the farms. I know as a man raised on the farm that if you go and get people who have never had any experience in farming and put them on the farm, you will not get the best kind of labor. Say what you may about it, in order to be a good farmer and render effective work, a man has got to have experience on the farm and know how to do that work.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. As a matter of hope, does the gentleman not think that the good wages paid by the Texas farmers to the Mexican laborers this past season will be an inducement to bring those same men back this year to harvest this year's crop? Is there not some hope in that?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. The question of good wages is an inducing cause which carries labor from one section of the country to another all of the time. It was the high price of labor in the factory sections of the country that induced these men first to leave the farm to get better wages. They are all human beings, and they are all selfish, just as we are. They

want the best wages they can get. We will get them back if wages will get them back. What did we do this year? All my life I have had cotton picked at the rate of 50 to 75 cents a hundred pounds—seed cotton. This year the high wages drove us to pay all the way from \$1 to \$1.50 a hundred for that crop.

Mr. HUSTED. To what extent would the gentleman say farm labor in Texas had been depleted on account of the war?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. It would be very difficult to arrange it on a percentage basis. I have not figured it out in that way. The only thing I know is of my own immediate community. There is scarcely a farm in the whole community, from a one-horse farm up, where one to two of the farmer's sons have not gone from the farm into the Army. I have not figured it out on a percentage basis, but you let that run through all the farms all over the United States and it will make a tremendous total. Who is going to say to the boy "No" when he says he is going to the colors? I can not tell a boy in my county not to leave the farm, and I am not going to do so. That is a matter that must address itself to him—what his duty is—but I do know that when he performs his duty as he sees it, and he leaves the farm and enters the service, there is a vacant spot on the farm that some one must be found to fill in order to cultivate and garner the crops in order that the armies at the front may be fed and our civil population may be cared for. It is a great problem that some one has got to work out. Some plan must be devised by which agriculture can be cared for. Of course, great prices for crops help in a way; but however great those prices may be, if you have not the labor to produce them, the crops can not be purchased and can not be conserved.

In this bill we have dealt in a practical way with the different problems that confront the different sections of the country. Where insects appear and the Government say they want to attack the problem, we have given such money as they have said they need, and it is proper to do so. Some gentlemen seem to criticize the appropriation for the eradication of the pink bollworm. It so happens that this insect has struck my State first. It came from Mexico, where many of our troubles come from.

The boll weevil came from there. I had overlooked the fact that along Trinity Bay and three or four counties in the Beaumont section have been ravaged by this insect. I did see that it was discovered up toward the central part of the State, where one field was thought to be infested. I hoped as a cotton grower that the Government specialists were mistaken as to the insects they have found, because I know the history of that pest in other countries. When it enters a cotton field it destroys the field and drives out the industry. That is not a Texas problem any more than it is a problem for the people in Massachusetts, where they manufacture the cotton that grows in that State. It is not a Texas problem any more than the foot-and-mouth disease was a problem of Illinois and for Central and Western States, because the meat problem was a problem for every State in the Union. It is not a Texas problem any more than the gipsy moth is a New England States problem, because that insect threatens the timber all over the country. It is a world-wide problem. Where are you going to get your clothing if the cotton industry is destroyed? This insect has made its appearance in my State. I hope that it may be wiped out. We have combated the boll weevil, and we have been able from year to year to make advancing gains on its destruction. It has been a great fight, too. When that insect first appeared there in my own district honorable men who had spent a lifetime buying their farms and rearing their children had their crops destroyed, and it was on the crop that they expected to survive, and those men made great sacrifices and sold their farms, believing that the insect could never be controlled. They practically gave their land away. But we have got control, and those same lands to-day are higher in value than they ever were in the history of the State. And I want to say to the gentlemen from the other cotton States of the South, as the boll weevil enters your territory advise your farmers to stay with their real estate and not to sacrifice it as so many Texas farmers did, as we have conquered the proposition and our land values are better than ever. Many of those people who sacrificed their lands are now tenants, and they never have been able to buy a farm again. I hope and pray that the pink bollworm, which is said to be more destructive than the boll weevil has ever proven to be, may be gotten under control, that the Government in cooperation with the States will be able to handle it. Only last year it appeared, and the Legislature of Texas made an appropriation. It is small, it is true, because at that time we did not know the seriousness of the menace, but they did better than that appropriation. They provided that sections of the country where this insect had ap-

peared should be segregated and no cotton should be planted, in order to wipe out the insect, in order that it might not scatter from there to other parts of the State.

You remember this insect is over the southeastern part of the State. That is 400 miles from where I live, in the great cotton belt of Texas, and now by these quarantine regulations on the part of the State, with the aid the Federal Government will give them through their experts' advice and cooperation, it is hoped that at one fell swoop this insect may be destroyed and not live among us as the cotton-boll weevil has all these years. The endeavors of the Government will reach across the Mexican border. There is a certain limited section of cotton territory from where this insect comes, and it is hoped by the aid of the Mexican Government and its people, through cooperation which has been promised, this whole thing can be wiped out in a year's time. Now, the truth is, while some gentlemen have criticized a \$500,000 appropriation, \$100,000 of it will be actually expended on this educational work—demonstration, and such methods as they use in a question of this kind, quarantine, and so forth—and the other \$400,000 is simply an emergency fund that will be used only in the event this insect shows up and it is necessary to use it in the infected section. It is not to be used otherwise, but to be turned back to the Treasury. So much for that item.

Now, on the other hand, as to our boys who go to the front from the farm and our factories and other avenues in life, I want to say, as far as my personal observation goes, I have seen very little evidence of slacking since the country's call, so far as my immediate section of the country is concerned, and so far as I know generally, there is very little evidence of it in any section. But they are gone. They are dependent on those of us left behind here, whether we are in Congress or out of Congress, to see to it that they are properly armed, that they are properly clothed, that they are properly fed, and that they have the proper medical supplies; and I, for one, want to do whatever I can do to see that those boys are gratified in their desires and their demands, because they are risking their lives for me and mine, and it is as little as I can do as an American citizen, as a Member of this body, to contribute my mite wherever I can and however I can in helping our boys at the front, that they may be properly cared for.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. I will.

Mr. DENISON. The gentleman has spoken about slacking in connection with the boys in Texas in this war.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. I did not limit it to Texas.

Mr. DENISON. I want to ask the gentleman from Texas, would he consider it slacking for a young man whose services were needed on the farm to claim exemption on that ground?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. If a man would figure it out as he would a mathematical proposition, a boy might be of more service on a farm than he is at the front. I feel that. Here is Bill on one farm and Sam on the other, constant companions for a lifetime and great friends, true boys. Bill feels it his duty to respond to the colors. That is where the Government calls and he goes, but Sam may feel he is called to remain on the farm and at once there arises in the community a proposition, why did Bill go and Sam remain? Call it what you may, that is a condition that arises immediately, and when you find one fine fellow volunteering the boy on the next farm to him is going, too. It is then up to us, knowing that it is true from one end of the Nation to the other, it is up to us, how are you going to fill the vacant place to make Mother Earth produce the sustenance that these boys must have at the front? I do not know; I have been thinking a good deal in my office lately where I can be of practical service. I try in every letter that I write to make some suggestion that will help in the community where that letter is written and I have mailed out something in the nature of a circular letter to numbers of people, calling attention to a need here and there, and I think some good has been accomplished from it. I believe that every Member of this Congress representing the various districts of the Nation—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEE of Georgia. I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. If we could feed out from here where we know the demands made on the Government in fighting this war and can get that information into the various sections of the country and wake people up as to the immediate need we can all do some good in a personal way in response to the correspondence that comes to us from every section of our districts. We have got it to do. Whether our service is on this floor or outside of this floor we have that great burden on us and with the conflicting problems that arise it behooves

every Member of this body to bestir himself to know just what he can do in a practical way to wake men to take some step or some action that will help to produce the food supply and conserve that food supply.

Great prices will not do it, as I said before. Great prices will not do it, and yet this price problem is a serious problem. Take gentlemen from the corn-growing States. That is their great industry. That is where they get their great resources from, and when they get good prices their people are usually prosperous if they can make a good crop; but prices now can not be compared with prices before the war, because—take one item in my State, where we used to get labor for 50 cents to pick cotton, and they got good wages picking three, four, and five hundred pounds a day, they now have to pay as high as \$1.50. The farmers who have got to buy cultivators to grow your corn have to pay 50 to 100 per cent increase on many of those items. Clothing the same way. Your harness is the same way. Besides, you do not grow everything you use. We grow one great crop, you grow another great crop, and as a united country a commodity that helps to make our respective communities great helps to make a great rich Nation, from which our wants are supplied; but when the corn crop fails in the State of my friend from Iowa, why Texas feels that failure.

And when the cotton crop fails in the great State of Texas the State of Iowa, my friends, feels that failure. And so it is true of the crops through all the farming industries. And the diversified interests that we have render us great problems in this bill from year to year in order that we may see to it that all of these industries along the agricultural lines may be properly cared for, and more abundantly cared for just now, because the world is at war. The war will be lost or won in the ability of the United States to furnish the food supply. God grant and give us the wisdom and the power as an American people that we may answer the cry of our own people and our allies, so that when this war ends we may be conscious of the fact that we have met the demands. The war won, and liberty, justice, virtue, and democracy may live forever. [Applause.]

Mr. LEE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD].

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, just now there is much criticism of our management of the war. Most of these complaints are unjust and very unfortunate.

The President, his Cabinet, and Congress are honestly and earnestly laboring for the common good. Murmuring and grumbling tend to dishearten and discourage them. Moreover, it is calculated not only to injure us in the estimation of our allies abroad, but to create distrust and lack of confidence among the people at home.

Taken altogether the progress made and the efficiency shown by the United States since the declaration of war have been marvelous. The world has been astonished at our success.

Undoubtedly many mistakes have been made in the performance of our gigantic task. It could not be otherwise. Did gentlemen think when we entered the war that it was to be a holiday; that it would cost us nothing; that we should achieve a succession of brilliant performances and make no blunders; that we should score a series of glorious victories and suffer no reverses? These were matters to be considered when we were determining whether we would go to war. It is too late now. We are in war, a terrible war, and the time has come when we must fight, not moan.

A bill has been introduced in the Senate to create a war cabinet clothed with powers to map out and direct war policies and have charge of war supplies. A bill somewhat similar has been introduced in this House. The adoption of this measure would be to take the conduct of the war out of the hands of the President and turn it over to the proposed war cabinet. To do this would, in my judgment, be to invite disaster. We should leave the management of the war with the President. I think it is to be regretted that such a proposition has been brought before Congress. Nothing can come from it except to stir up dissensions and strife at a time when our greatest need is a united people.

This war cabinet scheme has the support of able and patriotic men in both Houses of Congress, but it has received its momentum chiefly from strong influences outside of Congress.

Powerful manufacturers have contributed largely to this propaganda. Secretary of the Navy Daniels and Secretary of War Baker have both been very careful of the taxpayers' interests in purchasing war supplies. This has aroused the antagonism of some who desired greater profits and feel that they might have fared better with a war cabinet.

Another group which has been very active in its advocacy of the proposed war cabinet is composed of politicians who are seeking political advantage. Not only do they criticize the

present policies of President Wilson and Congress, but they rake the realms of the past for dead issues out of which to make political capital. They are still carping about the failure of the President and Congress to plunge the country into the European war at its outbreak to avenge the wrongs of Belgium. Much criticism is still being made against President Wilson and Congress because we did not go into the war upon the sinking of the *Lusitania*. Newspaper columns teem with abuse of Congressmen who, whether mistaken or not, voted against the declaration of war. All of these questions have gone into the past and can have no bearing upon the vital issues of to-day. This carping criticism and abuse is indulged in in the name of loyalty, but is in fact the efforts of ambitious politicians to gain favor by prejudicing the public mind against those who now enjoy the confidence of the people.

A characteristic example of this class is Col. Roosevelt. For several months he has been engaged in bitter denunciation of the President's management of the war. He has not confined himself to a discussion of Mr. Wilson's present policies, but has gone into the issues of the past to find something upon which he could arouse opposition. He claims this all is done to help win the war, but we can not escape the conviction that he is moved by an irrepressible yearning to strengthen himself in popular favor. The following is from an editorial in the *Kansas City Star*, written by Col. Roosevelt:

Our economic unpreparedness is just as complete as our military unpreparedness and is one of the chief factors therein. We are now paying bitterly for the fact that two or three years ago it was deemed politically wise to shape our Government policies along the lines of "watchful waiting" and "he kept us out of war." If three years ago we had begun in good faith and earnestly to prepare, and if when the *Lusitania* was sunk we had acted precisely as we did act, with no more provocation, in February last this war would now be over.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the President's policy of "watchful waiting" was sound. The most grievous affliction of our allies has been food shortage. The one thing that has made the ultimate defeat of Germany certain was the great crop of this country in 1917. Had our farmer boys been called to training camps two or three years sooner an insufficient food supply might have compelled England, France, and Italy to have quit the fight.

It is true that our slogan in the last campaign was "He kept us out of war." To that battle cry a majority of the American people rallied and elected Mr. Wilson President against the vehement advice of Col. Roosevelt. Was our position in that campaign correct? I think it was.

But suppose that "he kept us out of war" and "watchful waiting" were unsound policies. Suppose Mr. Wilson and Congress were in error in their failure to enter the European war at its beginning. Suppose Mr. Wilson and Congress blundered in not going into the war immediately upon the sinking of the *Lusitania*. Suppose Congressmen were mistaken in voting against the declaration of war in April. Nobody will contend that the President and Congressmen were not controlled by their conscientious judgment. These questions have all been swallowed up in the voracious yesterday and have no connection with the living, burning problems of to-day. Then why would Col. Roosevelt and scheming politicians of smaller caliber dig up and discuss those dead issues of the past? There can be but one reason for it, and that is a desire to secure political advantage.

Some light may be shed upon the motive of Col. Roosevelt for resurrecting these dead issues and trying to inflame the public mind over them by the news items appearing in the papers for the last few days since he came to Washington. Here is one from the *Enquirer*:

WASHINGTON, June 23.

Col. Roosevelt brought up the heavy artillery for a tremendous drive for speeding up the war. He rallied the congressional critics of the administration's conduct of military affairs and gave new heart to the movement for the creation of a war cabinet. The breach between the President and Congress widened to the breaking point. On every hand it is admitted that a crisis is on hand that perhaps will determine the future military policy of the United States against the central powers.

Col. Roosevelt's arrival in Washington this morning gave the congressional critics of the administration a leader who intends to make the best of his opportunity.

I will read an item from the *Post* of the same date:

Col. Roosevelt's candidacy for the Republican nomination in 1920 was given an impetus at the meeting of the subcommittee of the Republican national committee's executive committee yesterday. Among the Republicans the lines are being drawn between the Progressives, headed by Col. Roosevelt, and the old guards who are generally regarded as unalterably opposed to the consideration of Col. Roosevelt as a candidate.

Nobody doubts the loyalty of Col. Roosevelt, but all Americans must sorely regret to find this great man playing the patriotism of the country as a trump card in a political game. How inspiring it would have been to have found this wonderful genius of organization here not to lead a fight against the President

but to promote harmony with the President and a united effort to achieve victory for our country.

Mr. Chairman, our country faces an awful crisis. Before the war broke upon us there were many opinions amongst us as to the policy it were best for us to pursue. Some thought we should go into the war at the beginning to avenge the wrongs of Belgium. When the *Lusitania* went down the number who believed we should enter the war was greatly increased. When we met in extra session last April the President had reached the conclusion that the time had come to abandon the policy of "watchful waiting" and take aggressive action. Some of us believed we should still keep out of the conflict and demand redress of our wrongs when peace should be restored. Each was honest in his own view and would have been unmanly had he not contended for it, but when Congress declared war personal opinions were laid aside and all stood together for our common country. Those who advocated the war and those who opposed it—Democrat, Republican, and Socialist—all lined up together to bring victory to our arms.

Mr. Chairman, all of us—President, Cabinet officer, and Congressman—feel the weight of the appalling responsibilities resting upon us. We all desire to do that which is best for our country. In the performance of our solemn tasks we need the confidence and sympathy of the people and the guiding hand of God.

But, sir, notwithstanding the false notes sounded by the self-seeking few, it is encouraging to know that in this dark hour of war there is harmony and unity of purpose among our people. They hold themselves ready to sacrifice their all upon the altar of their country. They deny themselves fuel. They observe wheatless and meatless days. They stand with purse in hand to subscribe to Y. M. C. A. and Red Cross; to buy thrift stamps and liberty bonds. They submit to the most burdensome taxation to provide revenues for the support of our Army and Navy. Fathers and mothers restrain their sighs and their tears as they send their sons away to fill up the ranks of war. When our young men are called they solemnly, but promptly, go with unfaltering steps to carry their country's flag to victory.

Our souls are filled with gratitude that God has put it into the hearts of the people to so heroically and loyally consecrate themselves to their blessed country.

Mr. LEE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM].

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I am particularly interested in the subject which is under discussion to-day, that of the eradication of tuberculosis from the cattle of this country. As the Members present know, some two years ago I introduced a resolution to investigate this subject, and, through the assistance of the federation of labor of my State, cooperating with the Federation of Labor throughout the country, we were able to bring this subject before the various labor organizations, the women's clubs, and other organizations of the country, as to the importance of the eradication of tuberculosis. I told them at that time that there were some 2,000,000 cattle in this country suffering from this dread disease; that there were some 93,000 deaths each year from tuberculosis, and that 6,000 of these deaths could be traced in children who had contracted the disease from tuberculous cattle through the drinking of the milk.

I treated the subject upon the line of sanitation and health more than upon economic lines, because while I believed and while I realized the great importance of the economic question as to the eradication of tuberculosis, and while I admire the magnificent argument made by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] along that line, I believe the great and paramount question involved in the eradication of tuberculosis among cattle is to stop the spread of bovine tuberculosis among the people, and especially among the children of this Nation.

We hear a great deal about the conservation of the food supply, conservation of the fuel supply, conservation of this, that, and the other, but I tell you, gentlemen, the great question for our country and for every other white country on the face of the globe in these days is the conservation of humanity and the continuation of the white race with its power and might on this earth, and yet we sit idly by and appropriate the meager sum of \$250,000 for the eradication of tuberculosis among cattle, when we know we can trace the death of 6,000 children to that very cause. We appropriate some \$600,000 for the eradication of the cattle tick. We appropriate other hundreds of thousands of dollars toward eradicating the boll weevil. We appropriate hundreds of thousands of dollars for the eradication of hog cholera. All these large sums, as the gentleman from Texas says, are not matters for the State of Texas, not for the State of Iowa, or for the State of Massachusetts, but they involve the welfare and the prosperity of all the country from Maine to Florida, and from the Atlantic to the Pacific. We can not touch

upon any of these questions in any one State or in any one section of the country that we do not affect these other sections of the land. And so, as the gentleman said in reference to the boll weevil in Texas, in reference to the hog cholera in the South, in reference to these various other things, they are subjects in which the whole Nation is interested. And likewise is the whole Nation interested in the question of the eradication of tuberculosis from cattle.

I talked to Dr. Mohler. He said, "Yes; \$250,000 was all that they had asked for." "But," I said, "Doctor, what can you do with \$250,000?" He replied, "Not much. We can proceed along the line on which we have been proceeding, but we can not make much headway." "Suppose you had the \$1,000,000 which Mr. SLOAN has asked for in this bill?" He said, "If we had the \$1,000,000 we could pursue the subject with greater energy; we could go into the various States and campaign. We could show the people the great necessity for getting rid of tuberculosis; and we could use it with great advantage by adding to our present system of operation. But with \$250,000 we can merely proceed along the lines on which we are now proceeding, and which are extremely slow."

Do you know the lines along which they are now proceeding as recorded by Dr. Mohler? I quote from the hearing:

Before commencing the eradication work in a given area the subject will be presented in its true light, and they would decide by election their will in the matter. Every qualified voter should have the privilege of casting the ballot to decide whether or not tuberculosis should be removed.

Now, just imagine proceeding along lines where you leave the people to vote whether tuberculosis shall be eradicated or not. Did you leave it to the people to vote whether or not the boll weevil should be eradicated? Did you leave it to the people to vote whether or not the hog cholera should be eradicated?

Have you left it to the people to vote whether or not the white plague shall be eradicated from the human race? And yet here you are proposing under this method the using of \$250,000 to let the people of any given section say whether tuberculosis in cattle, which spreads disease among all the children of the country, shall be eradicated. And that is the system under the \$250,000 appropriation.

As Dr. Mohler said, "If you give me the money to eradicate tuberculosis from cattle, I can get rid of it, and I can get rid of it without these vast sums of money that the people imagine will be necessary." I said, "Doctor, what do you propose to do about these fine herds of cattle, where men have built them up for years, where they are proud of them and are interested in them? Do you propose to kill the cattle?" He said, "No. We propose to separate the diseased cattle from the perfect cattle, and then we propose to take the calves from the diseased cattle and put them with well mothers or feed them on pasteurized milk, and in that way we can save the diseased cattle, we can breed from them, and we can build up the herds to just as large an extent as at the present time and gradually get rid of the diseased cattle without any great loss." So there is no necessity for any great loss. Why, gentlemen, right here, as the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] has told you, tuberculosis in the District of Columbia has been reduced from 18 per cent to less than 1 per cent. In Maryland it has been reduced in vast herds from 12½ per cent to about 2 per cent, and throughout the whole section where they have worked and where they have had the money with which to work they have gradually eradicated or greatly diminished tuberculosis. I would like to see a million dollars appropriated for this work.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Maryland yield?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Certainly.

Mr. SLOAN. Dr. Mohler is the head of the Bureau of Animal Industry, is he not?

Mr. LINTHICUM. He is; and he is a man who has given a great deal of study to this work.

Mr. SLOAN. He is the best authority in the world, as I understand, on that subject. If he were given sufficient funds to carry out his plans, as outlined in his letter or statement to me, he would require, as you understand, about a million dollars?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes. He told me that if he had a million dollars he could make rapid progress in the eradication of tuberculosis, but that with \$250,000 the process would be extremely slow.

Mr. SLOAN. Then the bureau is ready to undertake that campaign if Congress assumes the responsibility and says, "Go ahead?"

Mr. LINTHICUM. Absolutely. But, as the gentleman knows, the heads of these departments are loath to ask for large sums of money. They have difficulty in getting them. It is not like

a war proposition. If somebody came in here and said he wanted \$5,000,000 as a war proposition you would appropriate it and leave it to him to expend to the best advantage; but if a man comes in here and tells you he wants the money to improve the food conditions and save the lives of children, you say to him, "Let us look into it and see how we can get along." I want to assure you that we ought to look after the interests of the women and children of this country, not only now but after the war is over.

Dr. Schroeder, an expert bacteriologist in the Department of Agriculture, stated before the Committee on Rules that 300 children die annually in New York City of bovine tuberculosis. On this basis the annual death rate throughout the United States from tuberculosis is 6,000.

I ask you, gentlemen, is \$1,000,000 too much with which to save the lives of 6,000 children in this country? Look at your own child in your own home, and say to yourself what would \$1,000,000 be to you if needed to save the life of that child. Yet you have 2,000,000 cattle in this country yielding diseased milk, from which children die of tuberculosis, and we stand here talking about giving \$250,000 for the eradication of this disease.

Dr. Mohler formerly was assistant chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry; now he is chief. Here is what he says: He told the committee that he had personally examined the bodies of a number of children who had died of tuberculosis, and he had found that over 42 per cent of them had died of bovine tuberculosis. Now, we have 93,000 deaths from tuberculosis in this country every year, and about 6,000 of those are from bovine tuberculosis.

I do not want, Mr. Chairman, to take up too much of the time of the committee to-day, but I do want to bring it to your attention that in addition to the economic question that arises as to the saving of cattle and the saving of hogs, which the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] has gone into so fully and brought to your attention, I want you to take under consideration just what it means to have this tuberculous milk going into the homes of the people of this country.

You know things have radically changed in the last 20 or 25 years. It used to be that the woman milked the cows in the morning and made the butter during the day, and then that butter was sold in the community or was fed to the members of the family. After awhile that condition ceased, and the little dairies and creameries sprang up in the neighborhood and the neighbors would carry the sweet milk to the creamery and there it would be turned into butter and the farmer would take the skimmed milk back home with him.

But that condition changed, and then it became possible, by refrigeration and otherwise, to ship this milk long distances and to turn it into butter and cheese and distribute it through all sections of the country. Nowadays, when tuberculosis in a herd of cattle exists in any one section of the country, you can not tell how far the ramifications of that disease may spread by transportation and refrigeration and by sale in the markets of the country. The milk that a farmer takes to the creamery is not, perhaps, drawn from any cattle affected by tuberculosis; but the skimmed milk he takes home may not be from his own cattle but from some other cattle, which may be affected with tuberculosis, and when he takes that milk home from the creamery and feeds it to the hogs it is possible for him through that milk to impart the disease to them. Over a million hogs slaughtered in Chicago were retained because they were affected with tuberculosis. Two thousand carloads of cattle packed together would constitute the amount of cattle that are rendered valueless on this account.

It is not only a question of economics but a question of sanitation, a question concerning the lives of the children and grown people of this country, and a question which certainly \$250,000 will not go very far toward solving. That sum of money will not go very far toward eradicating the disease.

Mr. WASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes.

Mr. WASON. Did I understand the gentleman to say that every creature that is affected with tuberculosis and is giving milk will carry the germs of that tuberculosis?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I did not quite catch the gentleman's question.

Mr. WASON. My question was, Will every creature that is affected with tuberculosis and is giving milk transmit the tubercular germs?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I say this, that if you had a child which had a tuberculous mother and that child were nursed by that tuberculous mother, it is more than likely, unless the constitution of the child was very strong, that the child would contract tuberculosis from its mother. But if you took that child when

it was young and fed it on milk not affected by tuberculosis it would not contract tuberculosis.

Mr. WASON. I understood the gentleman's illustration was that if Mr. A's herd was tubercular and the milk from that herd were transported to the creamery, Mr. B might take the milk home and feed it to his hogs and thus infect the hogs?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Perhaps I talked too fast for the gentleman to understand me. What I said was this, that if Mr. A had tuberculosis in his cattle, he would probably take that milk to the creamery, and he would probably not wait until his own milk was turned into butter, but would take the milk that had been furnished by some other farmer to the creamery and take it home; that if he fed the tubercular milk to his hogs, they were apt to contract tuberculosis. Some cows may have tuberculosis in those parts which does not affect the milk, but usually it does.

Mr. WASON. That was what I understood the gentleman to say. But my inquiry now, which was my first inquiry, is this: Does every milch animal infected with tuberculosis transmit it?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Oh, I think not. I think tuberculosis is transmitted very largely because of a weak constitution. Some children are born of tuberculous mothers who nurse them and the children do not contract tuberculosis because their constitutions are strong enough to throw it off, while others have weak constitutions and contract it. Cows may, as I have said, have tuberculosis not affecting the milk.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Mr. LINTHICUM. I thank the committee for their attention. [Applause.]

Mr. HAUGEN. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WOODYARD] two minutes.

Mr. WOODYARD. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the following telegram be read in my time.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHARLESTON, W. VA., January 24, 1918.

HOB. HARRY C. WOODYARD, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.:

Coal-car situation in Kanawha district shows absolutely no improvement in past two weeks. Worst supply to-day ever experienced, with 131 idle mines and 11,000 idle mine workers, account of no cars. Only 4,800 tons of coal equipment supplied to-day; order for 69,000 tons. Can you secure information indicating immediate improvement? Please answer.

KANAWHA COAL SHIPPERS' ASSOCIATION,
MAX T. PRICE, Secretary.

Mr. WOODYARD. Mr. Chairman, this telegram indicates a deplorable, and I might say an intolerable, condition, so far as the transportation system of this country is concerned. The people of this country are making and have been making many sacrifices. They are doing it patriotically and cheerfully, but it seems to me that the time has come when Congress can not sit passively here and allow conditions like this to prevail without at least taking some step to assist the executive branch of this Government in relieving it, as well as many other similar situations in the country. I am sure that every Member on the floor of this House wants to do only that which will help us to successfully prosecute the war; but I want to say, as emphatically as I can, that the time has come when the people of this country are going to demand, and are demanding, that the legislative branch of the Government step in and take some measures to relieve these conditions. [Applause.]

Mr. HAUGEN. I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON].

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this bill, but I do not intend to discuss it. I listened with some interest, as I always do, to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. YOUNG], but I do not entirely agree with him on the question of farm labor. I do not think that the young men whose services are necessary to cultivate the crops are in any sense of the word slackers when they claim exemption when drafted into the military service.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I did not say anything from which the gentleman can draw that conclusion. I said I personally might know that the boy who remained at home was doing greater service than he could do in the trenches. Yet his neighbor's boy, who had gone to the trenches might feel otherwise, and as a result, the two boys having been together, would follow the same course.

Mr. DENISON. I may have misunderstood the effect of the gentleman's answer to the question I propounded to him when he was speaking. I think this question of labor on the farm is one that is going to become very serious, and I think it is the duty of men to claim exemption when drafted under the draft law if their services are necessary on the farm. This suggests the question that I want to present to the committee, rather

than the agricultural bill under consideration, namely, the question of the administration of the draft law.

Mr. Chairman, the provost marshal general has filed his report to the Secretary of War on the first draft under the selective-service law, which presents some valuable information and some quite interesting conclusions. One of these conclusions is stated by Gen. Crowder in the following words:

ERECTING THE REGISTRATION SYSTEM.

From the moment American participation in the world war became apparently inevitable the enactment of the selective-service law was also inevitable. The trend of continental military organizations since the battle of Jena, and the inception of the junker idea of "the nation in arms" (not to mention the unprecedented military effectiveness of the German Empire in the present conflict), left no doubt that no intelligently directed nation could afford to enter the conflict with less than its entire strength systematized, organized, and controlled for war. Such systematization is impossible under any other than the selective plan for raising armies. The thinking element of the Nation was perfectly aware of the truth of this proposition, and Germany has given such a demonstration of its effectiveness that little argument was necessary to support it in May of this year, and none is necessary to-day. If farms, factories, railroads, and industries were not to be left crippled, if not ruined, by the indiscriminate volunteering of key and pivotal men, then, in the face of such an enemy as Germany, the total military effectiveness of the Nation would have been lessened, rather than strengthened, by the assembly of 1,000,000 volunteers.

With this conclusion I think the mature judgment of almost every loyal American will now agree, especially so in view of the events that have transpired and the military and industrial demands upon us that have become apparent since the enactment of the law on May 18 last.

When the draft law was under consideration in the House I was one of those who at first favored the old volunteer method of raising our Army. Many of my constituents, I thought, were opposed to the idea of compulsory military service. I represent a district where the volunteer spirit and belief in the volunteer system has always been deeply embedded in the minds of the people since the days when Gen. John A. Logan, then the Member of Congress from that district and afterwards the greatest of all volunteer soldiers, resigned his seat in this body and returning home organized his regiment of volunteers to fight for the preservation of the Union. My sentiments and my inclinations were at first favorable to the committee bill, which would have authorized the President to call for volunteers for a period of six months before the draft provisions should become effective.

But after more serious consideration of the question I became convinced that in a matter of such grave importance, where the adequacy and effectiveness of our fighting forces and possibly the very safety of the Nation was involved, I could not afford to follow my personal sentiments against the better judgment and experience of military men and others who were in a position to know better than I what military measures we should adopt.

With the President, the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, insistently urging Congress to eliminate the volunteer provision of the bill and proceed at once to raise an Army on the principle of selective compulsory service for all who were of military age; with the Secretary of War and the General Staff of the Army recommending it; with all the great metropolitan newspapers demanding it; with every Republican governor and our two ex-Presidents advising it, I did not feel that I as a Member of the minority party here should vote against the draft law with the volunteer provision eliminated simply because my personal sentiments were in favor of calling for volunteers. Moreover, my judgment told me that this world war into which we had entered was so different from all former wars in methods of warfare and in demands of man power and industrial resources, we could not afford to follow the old method of raising armies if another method more speedy and more effective could be found. And in that connection the disastrous experience of England, which delayed her preparation for effective participation in the war more than a year by depending on the volunteer plan of raising troops, was staring us in the face. We were urged not to make a similar mistake. I became convinced then, although I did not believe it then as firmly as I do now, that in order to win this war we would have to raise an Army of several million men in the shortest time possible, and that to do so without involving the Nation in industrial paralysis some sort of selective system of raising an Army, based on the principle of compulsory or universal obligation to service, would be necessary. I concluded that under the circumstances we could not wisely depend upon the volunteer system, and, since we could not, we had best begin right by at once putting into effect the draft law instead of waiting six months to do so, as was provided in the committee bill then under consideration.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, and for others which I stated here at that time, I voted for the selective-service law. Since

then great events have passed swiftly on the world stage and the realization that we are deeply in the war has more fully dawned on the people. If I do not misjudge the stupendous task and the magnitude of the sacrifice that yet awaits this country before we are again at peace with the world, the people everywhere will soon know, if they do not now realize it, that Congress acted wisely in passing promptly the selective compulsory-service law and that any other method of raising the vast armies that we will need would have been nothing less than disastrous. I believe the Provost Marshal General is right when he says in his report, "No intelligently directed nation could afford to enter this conflict with less than its entire strength systematized, organized, and controlled for war. And such systematization is impossible under any other than the selective plan for raising armies. The thinking element of the Nation is perfectly aware of the truth of this proposition."

After the draft law was passed and the machinery provided for immediately raising an adequate military force for training and service, I, with the other Republicans of the House, voted for the proposition to authorize the President to at once send a division of volunteers to France under Col. Roosevelt. This, I think, the President might well have done. It would have had a fine moral effect on the men and the issues in Europe and would have given an opportunity for many men in this country who had had military training to volunteer for immediate service in France.

But, Mr. Chairman, I found on returning to my district this fall that there was some opposition to the draft law among the people and some disposition to complain at the Members of Congress for voting for it. I am led to believe that this condition in my own district was not unlike the condition in many other parts of the country. I tried to ascertain the cause for some of the criticism I heard, and I think the information I obtained is worth calling to the attention of the committee.

In the first place, I think by far the greater part of the complaint and opposition to the draft law has been due not to the principles or provisions of the law itself but to the unhappy methods of the War Department in the administration and execution of the law.

There were a few—but a very few in my district, I am proud to say—who were opposed to the law and who complained at Congress for passing it, whose real opposition, as a matter of fact, was to the war. They were pro-Germans or pacifists who were opposed to our entering the war at all. They were unwilling, for reasons which are quite obvious, to publicly proclaim their opposition to the war. Public sentiment would not tolerate that; but they did mask their opposition to the war under a criticism of the draft law. And I wish to say now, Mr. Chairman, that these objections were not, with few exceptions, among the men of German nationality. I have a great many Germans in my district, particularly in two counties. They are among the most valuable, most industrious, and most successful farmers of my district. And I have never yet received a single letter from any of my German constituents objecting to our declaring war or criticizing me for voting either for war or for the draft law. So far as my own information goes they have, with very few exceptions, been loyal to the United States in this world struggle, and for such as have been loyal I have the highest respect and admiration.

Then I found some who disapproved the draft law because they sincerely favored the volunteer method of raising an army. In talking with some of these I found they were conscientious in their attitude, but they did not fully realize the magnitude of the problems before Congress and the country. They did not understand that Congress had to provide for obtaining quickly an army that might and probably would require several million men; that no one connected with the Government, the War Department, or with Congress believed we could raise the necessary men by calling for volunteers; they did not know that there were but two propositions considered by Congress for providing an army; that both of these provided for compulsory military service in identically the same language; one, however, putting the draft into immediate effect, and the other postponing the draft six months, during which time the President could try to raise the necessary troops by calling for volunteers; and that Congress approved the former plan upon the urgent recommendation of the President, the War Department, the General Staff of the Army, and all of the military men of the country. When they come to realize, as they surely will, that the entire strength of this Nation will be needed in this war, and that our entire strength can not possibly be systematized, organized, and controlled under the volunteer system alone I am sure they will in the end approve the action of Congress in passing the draft law.

Mr. Chairman, when the first quotas of men were assembled to entrain for the cantonments there was, of course, a feeling of distress among the friends and families of the drafted boys. This was only natural and has always been the case when men leave their homes in large bodies to fight for their country. But mingled with this feeling of distress there was also with many a feeling of resentment at the law which took the boys from their homes. This resentment not infrequently was manifested by criticism of Congress for enacting the draft law.

Mr. Chairman, the generally accepted idea of exalted patriotism is for a man to willingly offer his own life for his country. But I have sometimes thought that the fathers and mothers or the wives and children who are left at home are just as patriotic, when, with a smile on their faces and a blessing on their lips, they send their sons or husbands away to the front without complaint. It is one of the most bitter cups of life's journey, and I could not blame those who at first even felt resentful when their sons or husbands were taken away to fight the country's battles in this war. The fact is the events which brought the United States into this war transpired so rapidly the people could not for a time realize we were really at war. They knew, of course, there had been a declaration of war, but to them the war seemed far off. It was only when the law reached right down into almost every home in the land and took the sons and husbands and fathers that the people realized with an awful shock that we were really in the war. And there was at first a rebound in the public mind which found expression in resentment at the law.

I am proud to say, Mr. Chairman, that this resentment has been rapidly disappearing from among the people of my district. My people are loyal and patriotic. As they come to better understand the great peril in which our country finds itself—the great peril to our rights, our liberty, our democratic ideals, and our very existence as an independent Nation; as they come to better understand the stupendous military and industrial problems that confronted the country and had to be solved without delay—they will then realize, I believe, that Congress did the very wisest thing it could have done when it passed the selective-service law.

Mr. Chairman, I have found that a great deal of the adverse feeling of the people toward the draft law has been due to the administration of the law rather than to the law itself. And I desire to say that I believe there has been some justification for this criticism. In raising the first quota of troops the Provost Marshal General's office acted with a haste that was not only unnecessary but unwise; followed a policy that was not in harmony with the intention of the law; and issued rulings that were confusing to the local exemption boards and so contradictory as to be almost unintelligible. The people of the country should know that Congress has had nothing to do with the administration of the law. Responsibility for the manner of administering the law rests with the President and the War Department, and if any criticism is justified on account of the way the law has been administered it must fall upon the War Department and not upon Congress.

Section 3 of the draft law authorized the President to "exclude or discharge from service, or to draft for partial service only, those in a status with respect to persons dependent upon them for support which renders their exclusion or discharge advisable."

In this language Congress gave the President full authority to exclude or exempt from the draft all persons having wives, children, or other persons dependent upon them for support where such dependence rendered their exclusion advisable.

I was present while the draft law was under discussion in the House, and have reread the proceedings in both the House and the Senate. And I think I am safe in saying that it was the purpose and the desire of Congress that married men and those with children or others dependent upon them should be exempted, at least until such time as they were imperatively needed in the military service. Indeed, one of the strongest arguments made in favor of the draft law, as against the volunteer plan, was that under the selective plan men having wives or other dependents could be kept out of the service and the burden of supporting their dependents could be thereby saved to the Government. Congress authorized the President to exempt men with dependent families in the interest of the Government rather than of the individual. The Provost Marshal General says in his report:

The principle was deduced that no exemption authorized in the selective-service law was intended for the direct benefit of an individual, but that every such exemption was for the sole benefit of the Government.

Without doubt this is the true spirit of the law, but the War Department failed to regard this principle, and the best inter-

ests of the Government in the different rulings and instructions given to local exemption boards respecting exemption on the ground of dependency. In the first place, the War Department made a serious mistake in making local exemption boards judges of the law as well as the fact in passing on claims for exemption on the ground of dependency. This, I think, was contrary to the spirit and intention of the law.

Congress authorized the President to determine the status with respect to persons dependent upon them for support which would render the exemption of individuals desirable. Under this authority the President, acting through the Provost Marshal General, should, by proper regulations, have declared clearly and unequivocally the classes of persons whose exclusion from the draft be considered advisable on account of dependency.

Instead of fixing by Executive order or by definite departmental regulation or ruling the class or classes of persons that should be exempted on account of dependency, local exemption boards were left to determine for themselves, in each individual case, the advisability of granting the exemption, and no adequate or clear definition of the statutory terms "dependent for support" was ever given to local boards by the War Department. I know of at least one governor who right in the beginning appealed to the Provost Marshal General to clearly define the rule of dependency that should govern local boards in passing on claims for exemption. But it was not done, at least not until most of the men had been inducted into the military service. The obvious result was that local exemption boards often made their own rules of guidance in passing on claims for exemption. Congress did not intend for local exemption boards to determine the advisability of exempting individual citizens from liability for service. Congress intended, and so provided in the law, that the President should determine that question, and, having determined the class of persons whose status with reference to dependency rendered their exclusion from the draft desirable, the Provost Marshal General, with the approval of the President, should have instructed all local boards to exempt all persons coming within that class. Then the local boards would have been under the duty only of determining the simple question of fact whether claimants come within that class.

This has been done now, after the law has been in operation eight months, and will be followed hereafter in calling men into the service. But it was not done when it should have been done—before over half a million were called into the military service, many of whom should, under the law, have been excluded from the draft. There are thousands of young men in the different military camps to-day who have dependent families at home and whose families the Government will have to support, because of the failure of the War Department to properly administer the law that Congress passed. And this has resulted not only in added burdens on the Government but in unwilling soldiers, and discontented people at home as well.

Now, what has been the result of following a different policy?

In the first place, different exemption boards followed different rules in granting exemptions; there was an entire lack of uniformity in granting or refusing claims for exemptions all over the country. In southern Illinois I know of exemption boards that exempted almost every man who had a wife or children; I know of others that practically exempted none. One board followed a rule of its own, so I heard, of exempting a man if he had a wife and two children, but not so if he had only a wife and one child; another board had a rule to exempt men having a wife and child, but not so if the claimant had a wife but no child.

Mr. COLLIER. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. DENISON. I will.

Mr. COLLIER. I want to ask the gentleman for information if he has investigated and found that this nonuniformity among the different boards is general among the States, or if it is confined to one or two? I myself think there was a great deal of nonuniformity among the different boards.

Mr. DENISON. So far as I have heard, it extended generally everywhere.

Mr. COLLIER. There was no uniformity of action by the local boards, except in very few States.

Mr. DENISON. In very few States. Some boards would exempt men having wives and children whom they supported, while other boards refused exemption in such cases, where the husband or wife had relatives who were able and willing to support them. Some local boards would not exempt any man whose wife was physically able to get out and work for her own support.

In fact, the Provost Marshal General in his report says his office at one time made a ruling that if the parents of the registrant or of his wife were ready, able, and willing to undertake

the support of the wife during the husband's absence, local boards would be justified in refusing to exempt in such cases.

This ruling soon proved to be a mistake. Of it the Provost Marshal General says:

This ruling did not work well. The few boards that had been prone to hold married men for service in the absence of the most unequivocal circumstances of dependency took the rulings as authority to look into the material wealth of the parents of the husband or of the wife. Regardless of readiness and willingness, regardless of whether or not the wife had in the past been actually dependent on the labor of the husband for support, these boards held some married men for service wherever it appeared to them that, rather than let the wife suffer, the parents would undertake her support during the absence of the husband.

And then he says further in his report that all local boards were instructed to correct their errors in following this ruling by reopening all claims for exemption that had been denied under it, and that all such errors were happily corrected.

As a matter of fact, I know that there were a great number of such errors that were not corrected. Often local boards would not reopen cases, and commanding generals at the different cantonments would not release the men in many such cases after they had been inducted into the military service. And there are many men in these camps to-day who should have been exempted, and who would have been exempted but for these confusing rulings or lack of clear rulings by the Provost Marshal General, which in many cases misled local boards in the performance of their duties.

Mr. Chairman, one of the most fundamental virtues of any law is the absolute uniformity of its application and administration. A good law may be rendered obnoxious by a lack of uniformity in its application to persons similarly situated. And the people will, under the stimulus of patriotism, bear without complaint a law that is harsh and even burdensome if it falls upon all citizens alike. But where it is enforced in one way upon a citizen or number of citizens or the people of one community and in an entirely different way upon other citizens living in the same community or in adjoining communities, there is a just and legitimate ground for complaint.

Many people in my district have complained to me because some young men were denied exemption while other young men in other parts of their county or adjoining counties, who were similarly situated, were exempted.

In most cases the complaint was not that the registrant had to serve, but that men similarly situated had been excused from service.

I happen to know of one county in southern Illinois where there were two local exemption boards. One board had to raise a net quota of 188 men and the other a net quota of 283. The board with the net quota of 188 men called 256 registrants; the other board, to raise a net quota of 283, called 1,076 registrants. One board allowed but 53 claims for exemption, while the other board allowed 410 claims. One board exempted almost every married man who claimed exemption, while the other exempted very few. I assume that the conditions I have described prevailed in other parts of the country.

And the point I want to make clear is, that this condition was not due to any fault of the exemption boards themselves. In Illinois at least the most honorable, capable, patriotic, and valuable men in the different counties served on local exemption boards, and they served at a sacrifice of their own personal interests. These men, with the very highest self-sacrificing devotion to duty, performed their difficult duties the best they could as they understood them.

The blame must rest upon the War Department for failing in the beginning to assume the responsibility of classifying the men whose exclusion from the draft was advisable, instead of leaving that duty to the different local boards without sufficient instructions to enable them to administer the law uniformly over the country. And, Mr. Chairman, this action on the part of the War Department has resulted not only in a chaotic lack of uniformity in the administration of the law but placed a burden of responsibility upon the members of the local boards that I do not think was within the intention of the draft law; it subjected members of local exemption boards and even Congress itself to criticism, which, if justified at all, should fall upon the War Department.

The Provost Marshal General in his report admits that mistakes were made, and that rulings were made on the question of dependency that did not work, resulted in mischief, and had to be recalled. But he dismisses the matter by saying such mistakes were inevitable under the circumstances. I do not see why this should necessarily have been so.

Mr. Chairman, the selective-service law provides also for the appointment of district boards, with original jurisdiction, to dispose of claims for exemption on industrial grounds, and appellate jurisdiction in claims for exemption on other grounds. One of the principal purposes of providing a tribunal to review ap-

peals from the decisions of local boards granting or denying exemption claims was to more effectively insure uniformity in the administration of the draft law.

And yet I venture the assertion that as a general rule district boards treated their appellate work as a mere perfunctory matter. I venture the further assertion that the regulations and the ruling issued by the Provost Marshal General's office were such as to lead district boards to treat appeals from local boards in exemption claims as mere perfunctory or routine matters. For instance, on August 1, 1917, the Provost Marshal General issued a printed compiled ruling, from which I quote the following instruction to district boards:

It is not expected that district boards will reopen each dependency case in these automatic appeals, but it is intended that each case be scanned with a view to determining whether its result is in consonance with the expression of the principles of the regulations that is found in the rulings of this office and the decisions of local boards in similar cases throughout the country.

And on August 11, 1917, there was issued another pamphlet of compiled rulings by the same office containing this instruction:

It is true that all cases of discharge on the ground of dependency are appealed by the Government to the district board, but this clause is only inserted to secure uniformity in action. District boards are to examine these cases to discover departures from the law, regulations, and rulings; they will not and can not open every case on its merits. It is in the local boards alone, therefore, that the solution of the difficulty and the protection of deserving claimants lies.

I charge that these rulings of the Provost Marshal General gave authority to district boards to practically ignore claims for exemption on grounds of dependency appealed from local boards.

While I was in my district I heard what was a common report there, that the district board had never reversed a single decision of a local board in refusing an exemption claim, and that the board handled such appeals in a mere clerical or perfunctory manner, never looking into the merits of any claim. I do not know that this report was entirely accurate, but I do know it was the general belief among the people.

And when I read these instructions of the Provost Marshal General I was not at all surprised that district boards should have taken that view of their duties.

Mr. Chairman, I am not criticizing the members of district boards personally. They, too, had a difficult duty to perform, and they were men of the highest integrity and patriotism. But I do criticize the War Department for issuing such instructions to district boards as would cause them to ignore one of the very important duties imposed upon them by the act of Congress, and for which they were created. If the War Department had instructed district boards to actually reopen and consider all appeals that came to them from local boards in exemption claims, the unfortunate lack of uniformity in the decisions of different local boards in claims for exemption, particularly on the ground of dependency, would have been discovered and probably corrected.

Mr. Chairman, the draft law also authorized the President to exclude or discharge from the draft persons engaged in industries, including agriculture, found to be necessary to the maintenance of the Military Establishment.

One of the strongest arguments urged in support of the draft law by those favoring it, including President Wilson, was that in this war it would be absolutely necessary to leave undisturbed, as far as possible, those industries, including agriculture, that would be necessary to maintain the Military Establishment. To maintain the Military Establishment in this war it is necessary to feed and fuel our people, our allies, and our Army and Navy. It was urged that if we should undertake to raise armies by the old indiscriminate volunteer system, men in all industries under impulse of patriotism would enlist; key and pivotal men in important industries would go into the Army; and agriculture, so necessary to feed the Nation and its armies, as well as the mines and other industries necessary to the prosecution of the war, would be crippled. And it was urged that by the selective-draft system men necessary in these industries would be excluded from the draft in order to pursue their industrial duties which were just as essential as military duties. Yet, Mr. Chairman, this purpose of the law has been almost entirely ignored by the War Department in drafting into the military service the first 687,000 men. Why, the Provost Marshal General admits in his report that his office considered military necessity first and paid little attention to industrial necessities.

In this connection, I wish to quote the following strange admission in the report of the Provost Marshal General. On page 24 he says:

At the time of the formulation of these regulations the very grave industrial and agricultural problem before the Nation was recognized in this office; but, as shall be developed later in this report, the theory accepted here was that the responsibility for the determination of the

question whether this Nation was to contribute militarily, industrially, or both, to the allied aims in this cosmic struggle had been decided before this office was created; that the decision was for military cooperation; that this decision imposed upon this office the necessity of producing the first draft of men synchronously with the military preparation to receive them; and, therefore, that the paramount military necessity was to be adjusted to the agricultural and industrial necessity with the least possible disarrangement of the latter, but with the absolute military necessity always in the foreground.

With this thought in mind the first regulations were promulgated. No apology is needed for them. It is believed that they produced a result with such accuracy in respect to the plan that no substantial criticism can be made of them. Formally it is frankly admitted that they were full of faults.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, the decision that this Nation should cooperate militarily in the world war rather than industrially was made in the inner councils of the War Department before the Provost Marshal General's office was created and before the draft law was passed by Congress. Is there any wonder then that, in administering the law, regulations and rulings were issued by the Provost Marshal General's office that did not carry out some of the provisions or the purposes of the law?

According to the report there were called out and examined 3,082,949 men to raise the first 687,000 men. From this number there were exempted only 20,315 men on industrial grounds in the 4,557 counties or districts of the country, or a little more than an average of 4 men from each county or district.

And 33,528 men were exempted on agricultural claims, or a little over 7 men from each county or district. There were only 851 coal miners exempted from military service in the entire United States. Yet this country, as well as our allies, need nothing worse to-day than they need coal.

Mr. BLACK. Can the gentleman give us any figures as to how many coal miners were taken into the service? He says something over 700 were exempted. Does he have any figures as to how many were taken into the military service?

Mr. DENISON. No; I have not. I know there are about 15,000 coal miners in my district, and if any one of them was exempted on industrial grounds I have not heard of it. Yet we need fuel pretty badly. And we are going to need it worse, and so are our allies, before this war is over. The coal miners are patriotic in my part of the country, and there may not have been very many who claimed exemption on industrial grounds, but if the war continues very long we will have to protect the supply of labor in coal mines whether the men claim exemption or not.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. DENISON. Yes.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Is it the gentleman's opinion that the administration of this first draft interfered unnecessarily with agriculture, from the fact that not as many were exempted as should have been?

Mr. DENISON. I think so. I heard the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Young] a while ago, when I believe the gentleman from Nebraska was not present, and he said that was one of the great problems now before the country, that the men had been taken off the farms to go to war, producing a greater scarcity of farm labor.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Then, if it should be established that these men were called into the service before their camps were ready for them, before the War Department were able to clothe and house them properly, in addition to the lack of preparation in that respect, the fact that they were not allowed to give their services to agriculture when labor is so essential to agriculture during the fall, it interfered to that extent also, that they were called out at a time when they were essential to agriculture and when agriculture could have used them to the advantage of the country, as well as at a time when the War Department had not prepared to receive them in the training camps.

Mr. DENISON. Exactly. I can show, if I have time, that according to the Provost Marshal's report itself there was practically a race being run between his office and other branches of the War Department, and that he was trying to get the men into the service by the time the cantonments were ready; and he admits that this was unfortunate, because he got the men ready and sent them into the service before the War Department had prepared for them. This haste was unnecessary and was unfortunate, because it was at a time when the men should not have been taken from the farms unless that was absolutely necessary.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. September, October, and November are the months when we plant the wheat and harvest the corn, are they not?

Mr. DENISON. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENISON. I will.

Mr. TILSON. Speaking of the coal miners, will the gentleman say whether many of them applied or asked for exemption?

Mr. DENISON. Yes; a great many of them did. A great many claimed exemption on industrial grounds, and some of these men that were claiming it were what is termed by the Provost Marshal General "pivotal men," men who had charge of important work essential to the operation of the mines, and they could not get a single exemption. In fact, the first regulations issued by the Provost Marshal General's office seemed to look solely to the question of military preparation and omitted industrial preparation.

Mr. TILSON. Does the gentleman think that if there was some sort of an arrangement made by which a man exempted for real reasons—a munition worker or a farmer or a coal miner—could have some recognition of the fact that although he was willing to go and serve his country, nevertheless it was more important for the service that he stay at home—does the gentleman think that something of that kind would encourage men to stay at home or cause more men to apply for exemption?

Mr. DENISON. I do not think it would cause more men to apply for exemption.

Mr. TILSON. There are munition men working in my district who refused to apply for exemption, saying that it will be said that "I showed the white feather or a yellow streak," and they did not apply for exemption when they were absolutely essential to the manufacturers.

Mr. DENISON. One of the strongest arguments made here in favor of the selective-service law was that by passing it we could protect these industries. I think the time will come when the Government itself will have to protect the industries even if the men do not claim exemption.

Mr. TILSON. I think the gentleman is correct; and in doing so it will be helped by making some recognition of the fact that these men are not showing the white feather, are not showing a yellow streak, but doing that work which is best and most advantageous to winning the war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. I yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENISON. Yes.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I see that the gentleman has gone exhaustively into the subject, and I would like to ask him if he was able to learn who in the Provost Marshal General's Office was responsible for these men being sent out under draft before the Quartermaster General or the Surgeon General was prepared to take care of them?

Mr. DENISON. I can not answer the question. The Provost Marshal General says that he did it because he was ordered by other departments in the War Department to do it.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. He does not take the responsibility?

Mr. DENISON. No; he avoids the responsibility.

Mr. STEVENSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENISON. I will.

Mr. STEVENSON. Does the gentleman know how many appeals from the district boards to the President on industrial ground have been sustained?

Mr. DENISON. I can not give the figures, but I think the gentleman can find them in the report of the Provost Marshal General.

Mr. STEVENSON. I have been unable to hear of one single instance.

Mr. DENISON. I have never heard of one in my section of the country.

In my own district, Mr. Chairman, I heard of a few cases where farmers were allowed a short time to gather crops before being taken to the military camps. But I did not learn of a single case where a farmer was exempted on agricultural grounds, or where a coal miner or railroad man was exempted on industrial grounds. I represent a district, Mr. Chairman, that is not only a great farming community, but is also one of the largest bituminous coal-mining districts in the United States. I know of cases where the most necessary employees of coal mines and railroad shops were drafted, and not one was exempted on industrial grounds. I know of many cases where boys were taken from farms when absolutely no one was left to gather crops or plant new ones, and not one was exempted on agricultural grounds.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that the country should know that one of the very important purposes of the selective-service law, namely, the protection of industries, including agriculture, from disturbance by reducing the supply of labor, has been almost entirely ignored by the War Department. And I think that the country ought to know that the blame or criticism for this must rest not on the Congress for enacting the law, but on the War

Department for failing to administer the law in accordance with its plain purpose and provisions.

And let me call the attention of the committee to the following very illuminating statement in the Provost Marshal General's report:

Admittedly, also, and for the reasons hereinbefore stated, these early regulations were not addressed to the complete solution of what must now be recognized as the high functions of this office—the striking of the ultimate balance between the industrial, including the agricultural, needs of the Nation and its military needs. With a full realization of its ultimate problem, the first regulations were, nevertheless, intended to serve solely as an expedient which should produce the military result required, with far greater expedition, as it afterwards proved, than was demanded, but in a way such as would never permit this office to fall behind the supply departments in the military preparation of the Nation, and at the same time would protect other national activities against indiscriminate drafts on labor supply. That they have been effective in their result and to this end can never be questioned.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I think they can very properly be questioned; and this admission by Gen. Crowder of the blunders of his office in the regulations under which the first half million or more men were drafted into the military service, and the announcement that a different policy will obtain in drafting men hereafter, may be reassuring to the young men of the country who will hereafter be called into the service. But it is poor consolation to the thousands of young men and to the families of those men who are already in the service, and properly would not have been if the War Department had more carefully carried out the plain purposes of the law.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, let me add that I observe that the Provost Marshal General in his report speaks with great emphasis and with apparent pride of the achievement of his office in preparing the regulations and organizing the complicated machinery for putting the selective-service law into execution and having the drafted men ready for delivery to the different military camps by the time originally fixed by the War Department.

We must give credit to whom credit is due. To select over half a million men from civil life and be ready to deliver them by the first or middle of last September was a most remarkable achievement. The war came to this country with a sudden and terrible crash. Men, munitions, supplies, and ordnance had to be furnished by the Government quickly and in great quantities. It fell to the Provost Marshal General to produce the men, to the Quartermaster General to produce the cantonments to receive them and the supplies to equip them, and to the Ordnance Bureau to produce the guns and munitions with which they are to fight.

It is a fact worth calling to the attention of the country, I think, that with all our great wealth and resources we have been able to produce men far faster than we could produce either the camps to receive them, the clothes to clothe them, or the guns and munitions with which to equip them.

And it must be said with humiliation, if not with shame, that the men were produced and sent to the military camps before the camps were completed to receive them, before clothing was provided to clothe them, before equipment was ready to protect them from the weather, and before guns were ready to supply them.

Yes, the Provost Marshal General produced the men with remarkable speed. He himself says the regulations and plans for executing the draft law were prepared in his office six weeks before the draft law was passed by Congress. Of course, they did not fit the law exactly as it was afterwards passed, but they were sufficient to produce the men. Gen. Crowder says, on page 13 of his report:

The responsibility was upon the office of the Provost Marshal General to produce men as rapidly as they could be accommodated and absorbed into the Army, and the information then furnished by the War Department was to the effect that the Army would be prepared to receive a first call of over half a million men during the month of September, 1917.

Again, he says on August 8, the War Department directed him to furnish 30 per cent of the first draft on September 1, 30 per cent on September 15, 30 per cent on September 30, and 10 per cent as soon after September 30 as practicable.

He further says "unexpected delays in the erection of camps and the accumulation of supplies caused deferments of the original call, and that his office produced the military requirements with far greater expedition than was demanded."

Mr. Chairman, we can not blame the Provost Marshal General for drafting the men into the service before the War Department was ready and equipped to receive them. He was ordered by the War Department to do so. But the War Department, or the system under which it operates, must be blamed for this unfortunate blunder. Many of the drafted boys from Illinois were told to leave their own overcoats at home. They went into camps that were not ready to receive them, and, though the weather was cold, for weeks they did not have blankets or overcoats. And the unfortunate conditions in the different camps disclosed by Senator CHAMBERLAIN, the chairman of

the Military Affairs Committee in the Senate, this week suggest that it would have been better for the country if the War Department had not acted with quite so much speed in sending the drafted men into the military camps.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad that entirely new and different regulations have been prepared and put into effect by the Provost Marshal General, under which the young men of the Nation will hereafter be drafted and sent into the military service in accordance with true purpose and provisions of the law. We must protect the industries and the farms of the country that are necessary to the maintenance of our Military Establishment from too great depletion of labor. Especially must the supply of labor for the farms and coal mines and munition plants be conserved as far as possible. Mr. Chairman, I would not criticize any branch of the War Department if to do so would embarrass anyone in authority in the prosecution of the war. I will hereafter, as I have heretofore, support the President in everything the Government needs to conduct the war to a successful conclusion. I have called attention to these matters, because there has been some just complaint among the people over the administration of the selective-service law, and they are entitled to know on whom, if anyone, the blame should fall. [Applause.]

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. CLARK of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am not going to make any lengthy address. I do not desire to consume the time of this committee but very briefly. The subject matter about which I wish to make some remarks, while not perhaps germane to every provision of the bill before us for discussion, is nevertheless germane to the subject of the bill, namely, agriculture.

It so happened that I was appointed a member of the Pennsylvania public safety committee, and in connection with the discharge of my duties I became chairman of the food supply of the local committee in my State. In discharging those duties I came in contact with the producer, with the person who handles the output, and also with the consumer, not only in one portion of the State but, to a considerable extent, in the entire State. I have attended meetings that have been called by the committee of my State. I attended the meeting held under the auspices of the Pennsylvania committee in Philadelphia not long since; informative addresses were made by prominent State and national officers.

That to which I wish to call the attention of the House is the very grave condition that confronts this country at the time respecting the scarcity of farm labor. Early in the spring of this last year I was called to the western portion of the State and engaged in the perfecting of an organization which adopted plans and set men at work, and the results were very gratifying, and reports of that work were made to two departments of this Government—the Agricultural Department and the Department of Labor. These reports were considered by the officials of those departments as of considerable value. All I wish to do now is to ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Record along these lines.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. RAMSEYER].

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Chairman, we are just beginning to learn that this war is not alone a contest between contending armies on the field of battle. The work of the people back of the line will have more to do with bringing triumph to our cause than the embattled hosts. The American farmer must grow more foodstuffs than the German farmer, the American miner must mine more fuel than the German miner, and the American factory must produce more than the German factory. Every man must take a hold and do his level best. Victory on the battle field will be impossible unless we first have victory on the farm, in the factory, and in the mine.

This war is more a contest of economic resources than it is of men under arms. To sustain our armies we must have the cooperation of every useful industry, trade, business, and profession of the country. These must be at the highest degree of productivity and efficiency. Close cooperation of all the activities of the Nation are necessary to win the war. As Kipling puts it:

It ain't the guns nor armament
Nor funds that they can pay,
But the close cooperation
That makes them win the day.
It ain't the individuals
Nor the army as a whole,
But the everlastin' teamwork
Of every bloomin' soul.

These lines of Kipling apply with even greater force to the people back of the line than they do to the men who constitute the Army.

We have heard a great deal since our entrance in the war about the shortage of labor in certain factories, in the shipyards, and on the farm. That is undoubtedly true. I am more familiar with the farm situation, and I believe it is true as it applies to the farms of the country. Now, the question arises, Are we short the man power to obtain maximum agricultural and industrial production from the farms and factories of the Nation and at the same time maintain intact an army of two or three million soldiers? I am sure we are not—especially is this true if every able-bodied man works or is made to work. In this conclusion I am in accord with Secretary of Labor Wilson. He said January 9 of this year, "There is an ample supply of labor both for the Army and for industry, the problem is one of proper adjustment." Again, he said, "Of course the draft will interfere with industry to some extent, but we have 35,000,000 workers, of whom approximately 1,500,000 will be taken the first year of the war, less than the normal number of unemployed. Our problem, then, is one of readjustment to supply the demand for workers."

I am inclined to think that the Secretary of Labor is right, and that there is an ample supply of labor if it is properly readjusted. On January 3, six days before this statement of the Secretary of Labor was made public, I introduced a bill intended to aid in the readjustment of labor in this country. The bill is H. R. 8001, and the title states its purpose, as follows:

Providing for the registration of all male persons of the United States between the ages of 16 and 60 years, both inclusive, for industrial and military service during the present war and for one year thereafter; to prevent idleness; for the assignment of all able-bodied male persons between the ages of 18 and 60 years, both inclusive, to labor in some industry, business, trade, or profession essential to the maintenance of the Military Establishment and necessary to the protection and welfare of the people of the United States, and for other purposes.

Sections 1 and 2 of this bill provide for the registration of all male persons between the ages of 16 and 60 years, both inclusive. These sections are copied almost verbatim from the draft law of May 18, 1917. The object of the registration provided for in these sections is to ascertain where the man power of the Nation is located and how it is employed. Information absolutely necessary before an intelligent readjustment of the labor of the country is possible. The information thus obtained is also necessary to enforce other sections of the bill. The records of this registration can also be used from which to draft men into the Army in event Congress changes the age limits for compulsory military service or in event Congress by law provides for universal military training.

Section 4 makes it the duty of every able-bodied male person between the ages of 18 and 60 years, both inclusive, to be regularly and continuously engaged or employed during the present war and for one year thereafter in some lawful and useful industry, trade, business, or profession, or in some public service. Idleness during this period is punishable as a crime.

Sections 5, 6, and 7 make provisions for listing essential industries in the order of their importance to the Military Establishment and also for listing nonessential industries, and empowers the President, in case of labor shortage in the essential industries, to draft laborers from the able-bodied male persons between the ages of 18 and 60, both inclusive, who are either idle or engaged or employed in the nonessential industries and to assign them to labor in the essential industries.

This, in brief, is the bill. Those of you who are interested can get a copy of the bill and study it in detail. The object and purpose of my bill is to give the Government the power to mobilize the man power of the Nation for industrial service necessary for the maintenance of the Military Establishment as well as for military service. It is simply the principle of compulsory military service applied to industrial service during the war. And why not? One service is just as essential as the other. The one is of no avail without the other. The bill proposes to require or compel every able-bodied man within the age limits to serve where his services shall be most effective in bringing about a successful termination of the war. Idlers and slackers at home are no better than are idlers and slackers in the Army, and should receive the same treatment. It is high time that the weary loafers and the well-to-do idlers go to work. If they do not, the wrath of the Nation will surely fall upon their heads. The principles of this bill will make us truly democratic and this democratic war will be carried to a successful conclusion in a truly democratic way. If the war is carried on in a broad democratic way, as this bill contemplates, we will not only conquer the enemy but we will conquer ourselves.

Criminal or regulatory laws are never enacted for the majority but for the minority, who do not appreciate or understand the

obligations and duties they owe to their fellows. So this bill, if enacted into law, will not affect or disturb in any way the vast majority of the people of this country, who are already regularly and continuously engaged or employed in useful and productive industries, such as the farmers, the miners, and others engaged in the many essential industries. The fundamental purpose of the bill is to make all the man power of the Nation useful in the prosecution of the war, and to induce—and if necessary to compel—every able-bodied man to contribute his might to the country's welfare. [Applause.]

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Yes.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. To whom does the gentleman propose to have the profits of the man's labor go—to the private individual?

Mr. RAMSEYER. The bill in detail provides that drafted laborers shall be paid the same compensation as other persons in the same industry doing similar work. I have not time to go into the details of the bill.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. The gentleman made a comparison between drafting a man for military service for the Government and for industrial service. In the military service the man serves the Nation; in the industrial service he would serve the individual. Would the gentleman have the profit from the labor go to the Nation or to the individual?

Mr. RAMSEYER. In modern war the farmer is just as essential to victory as is the man in the line, and men should be required to serve wherever the Nation needs them.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. If he is serving the Nation, but when he serves me as a farmer it is a different situation, is it not?

Mr. RAMSEYER. There is some difference, I admit.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Did not we fight a war in this country for four years over the question of denying to a man the profits of his own labor?

Mr. RAMSEYER. The bill designates the services to which men shall be assigned, and among the first are the industries of the Government. The bill contemplates that the idle and those in nonessential industries shall be assigned wherever needed.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. If we should take these industries over, then I think the gentleman's bill would apply; but if we leave them in private hands, I would have to differ with him.

Mr. RAMSEYER. I am glad to know we agree in part.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has made a very interesting statement. Has the gentleman considered the proposition of calling men into the Army, men engaged in the industries, agricultural, and other essential industries, and then furloughing them back to the industries, the continuance of their furloughs being conditioned upon their remaining in the industries, on the farm, for instance?

Mr. RAMSEYER. There is nothing in the bill that covers that. Of course, the question of furloughing a man from the Army, for instance, next spring, taking the farmer boys and sending them back to the farm to help in planting and in the harvest, if they are not needed overseas, I think is a matter for the Executive to handle. After a man once gets into the Army, then he is wholly under the control of the Commander in Chief.

Mr. LEVER. The thought I had in mind is this: Let us take a young man 25 years old, in good physical condition, except, perhaps, that he has lost a finger, which might give him exemption on account of physical disability. That man may be a very good farm hand. Is it quite right that he should be exempted from all services, or is it worth while to think of lowering the physical requirements, drafting them into the Army and then furloughing that type of man back to the industries?

Mr. RAMSEYER. It is not right to exempt any able-bodied man from rendering service to the country during the war? I am not undertaking to discuss the bill in detail, but I think the bill covers that situation.

Mr. LEVER. The point I am getting at is what kind of machinery are you going to develop that is going to do that thing. I agree with the gentleman's principle absolutely, and I have thought a good deal about it.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Sections 5 to 7 of the bill provide for the machinery, and in fact places it in the hands of and authorizes the President by order to use the same organization that he has for conscripting the Army, and such other agencies as may be available and appropriate to aid him in carrying out the provisions of the bill.

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman will permit me one moment further, the gentleman understands, of course, that the disruption

of labor has not come so much from the operation of the selective-draft law, because that has made comparatively small drains upon the labor supply, as it has come, as he knows, from other causes, one of the chief causes being that men have gone from the farm into industrial pursuits, which pay higher wages. For example, in my own immediate country many farmers left the products on the farm to waste while they went to the cantonment near by to work as carpenters. A good many of them left the State to go into the munition factory down here on the Potomac River. And that is true, I take it, all over the country.

Now, the gentleman's proposition is properly to adjust that situation by some method or other which the gentleman has worked out in the bill. I shall certainly read the bill with a great deal of pleasure.

Mr. LITTLE. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SHALLENBERGER] suggested that the bill is well framed to meet the conditions industrially that the Government should take over. Does not the gentleman think perhaps, in view of the way the Government is stepping along in that direction it is about time to make some arrangement to meet that situation?

Mr. RAMSEYER. It not only applies to the industries the Government shall take over, but to other industries which are designated in section 6 of the bill.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. I will ask the gentleman his opinion on this question, as to whether or not there is any right under the Constitution for the Government to make men work unless they are taken into the military service and be made part of the military force?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Oh, I have not thought so much of that. I think there is as much right there, inasmuch as this service is necessary for the maintenance of the Military Establishment, to make the men work to support that establishment as to make them serve in the Army.

Mr. DENISON. I will grant that is true, if taken into the military organization, but if he is still a private citizen has the Government the constitutional right under any circumstances to make him work, unless, of course, he was a prisoner?

Mr. RAMSEYER. That does not worry me. An able-bodied man has no more right to be idle than he has to steal.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. What is the meaning of the words "involuntary servitude," unless it means a man working for another person against his will?

Mr. RAMSEYER. That very point was raised in the selective-draft law and decided by the Supreme Court in favor of the constitutionality of the law.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. That is military service; I am speaking of industrial service.

Mr. RAMSEYER. I admit there is a difference, but not that such industrial service would be unconstitutional.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Has the gentleman any idea of the number of idle men in this country?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Yes; an idea but no statistics except what is contained in the statement of the Secretary of Labor referred to. I will now take up the discussion of the food production.

FOOD PRODUCTION.

In this connection, I desire to make some observations with reference to the farming situation and outlook. We spend most of our time talking about the Army and Navy. These subjects are important, very important; but there is another subject more fundamental; that is, the production of an adequate amount of food. Without food, which is growing scarcer daily, our cause is lost. It is about time that Members of Congress and the people wake up to that fact, for it is the man behind the plow who keeps the man behind the gun. Listen to the authorities that I present to show you the seriousness of the food situation:

ROME, January 21, 1918.

"Food is the most important matter now before the allies," David Lubin, American representative in the International Institute of Agriculture, said to-day. He added: "It is useless to deceive ourselves. In view of the increasing consumption of food and decreasing production we shall be unable to feed our armies unless exceptional weather prevails this spring and unless extraordinary measures are applied. Europe's crops may be worse than last year's. The mobilization of women of the United States for farm work may be necessary."

This morning I received through the mail a memorial presented to the President by the Federal Board of Farm Organizations, which represents 2,000,000 farmers. Here are a few paragraphs of the memorial:

We know that the world is short of food. The crops now available are barely sufficient to meet the urgent need, and next year the world shortage is certain to be worse. Insufficient food supplies involve a most serious threat to the early and victorious conclusion of the war, for a starving people can not fight. Unless the farmers of the United States can fill the mouths of our own people and our allies, they will not be filled. Just how great the demand for American food will be we can not yet foretell, but we know already that a larger crop is absolutely necessary.

If food is to win the war, as we are assured on every side, the farmers of America must produce more food in 1918 than they did in 1917. But unless present conditions are radically changed, increased crops next year are impossible. Under existing conditions we can not equal the production of 1917, much less surpass it, and this for reasons over which the farmers have no control.

The American farmer does not ask to be relieved of any task or any burden which belongs to him. He asks for no class exemption, nor special consideration of any sort. The duty which the Nation and the times have laid upon him he desires to fulfill. But he can not make bricks without straw. The conditions which prevent increased production are national conditions, and only the National Government can remove them. It is the duty of the Nation to give the farmer a fair chance to succeed in raising the food the Nation needs, just as it is the duty of the farmer on his part to leave no furrow unturned.

A dispatch appearing recently in one of the great dailies of Iowa states:

Interviews with farmers in various parts of Iowa have revealed the fact that 10 per cent less corn will be raised this year in the Hawkeye State than in 1917, principally because of a lack of farm labor.

I do not wish to be understood as expressing my judgment that there will be less raised in Iowa this year than last. On this subject I have had some correspondence with county farm agents, chairmen of county councils of defense, and others. These gentlemen differ in their views as to the outlook for increased food production in Iowa, but most of them agree that the shortage of farm labor presents a serious situation.

Iowa is the leading corn-producing State in the Union. If less foodstuffs will be raised in Iowa this year, what can we expect from the rest of the country? Along this same line a certain publicity bureau on January 3 had this statement:

In the East the matter is being taken up, and the press of New York City is giving it prominent notice. Word has come from Connecticut that that State has been "positively combed clean" of laborers of every description, and thousands of valuable farms in that section of the country are lying idle as a consequence.

I could cite you further proofs along this line, but these are enough. It presents a situation that is appalling. There is no use to talk about winning this war if we do not produce more foodstuffs this year than we did last, and more next year than we do this year. If we do not increase our food production, we are going to be licked. We ought to quit wrangling about the creation of a war council and go to farming. We must dig a hole and bury politics until after the war and go to work. [Applause.] What the war needs right now more than a secretary of munitions is 1,000,000 and more additional farm hands. The farm hands will keep this country and the allied nations from starving, while the President already has more secretaries and counsels than he can handle to advantage. The people are demanding that this Congress differentiate between essentials and nonessentials, and that we get busier in actions than in words.

What do we propose to do to increase the production of the farms? We can not pass it by. We must face and solve that problem or face defeat. Last spring the Department of Agriculture seriously proposed a plan to conscript the idlers and high-school boys of the cities to relieve the shortage of farm labor. Why the combination of idlers and high-school boys I never quite understood. But the plan is so utterly impractical that it never received serious consideration from anyone who ever saw or knows anything about a farm.

There is a certain group of college presidents and certain boards of financiers who are urging a change in our laws to permit the importation of Chinese coolies for farm labor. To me such a plan, even though it might be practical, is unthinkable. The American farmers are patriotic and are willing to offer up their sons to die for their country's cause. But the American farmer is hardly in a frame of mind to receive into his home a Chinaman to take the place of a son who has gone to serve his country in the trenches. With that I pass up this plan as not worthy of further consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. RAMSEYER. An examination of the 1910 census figures shows that the total farming population between the ages of 18 and 60 at the time was 9,304,700, of which there were farm owners 3,372,500, farm managers 55,600, farm tenants 2,051,400, and farm laborers 3,825,200. The Department of Agriculture estimates that at this time the number of retired farmers not engaged in any gainful occupation is 1,400,000, of which about one-half, or 700,000, probably are under 60 years of age. I think it is fair to presume that most of the 700,000 retired farmers under 60 years of age are physically able to render valuable farm service. There ought to be some way to induce or to compel them to render such service during the war.

Mr. LONDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSEYER. I will.

Mr. LONDON. Now, is that the very fact which the gentleman has to establish—that the retired farmers are of an age which would permit them to do physical work? Are not these retired farmers of an age which would make it impossible for them to do hard physical work?

Mr. RAMSEYER. No; I have just gotten through saying that half of the 1,400,000 are under 60 years of age, and the bill only applies to able-bodied male persons.

Mr. LONDON. Where does the gentleman get that figure?

Mr. RAMSEYER. From Secretary Houston.

Mr. LONDON. How does he get it?

Mr. RAMSEYER. I do not know. I have a letter in my pocket to that effect. Many of these men are around 40 and 50 years of age and physically as able as you or I.

It is also estimated that there are several million boys and young men not now engaged in farm work but who have had more or less farm experience. There is absolutely no use to attempt to place boys or men on the farms who have had no farm experience and who can not or do not want to adjust themselves to the social conditions of farm life. To get more farm production we must have men and boys of farm experience. Others would be a detriment rather than a benefit to farming operations. Only by liberal exemption of farm labor from military service, by enlisting the retired farmers, and by utilizing the men and boys of farm experience but who are now engaged in something else, can the shortage of farm labor be relieved and an increase of food production brought about.

I fully appreciate the difficulties of placing into effect a draft law for industrial service. However, whatever else we do, the male population within certain ages ought to be registered to give the Government needed information for the readjustment of labor. It would also have a good psychological effect, as it would tend to impress each person required to register of his duty to render useful service during the war. I am abidingly convinced that a law should be enacted at once making idleness a crime, which should apply with equal rigor against the well-to-do and the improvident alike. This country has before it a herculean task, which will require the united efforts of the manhood of the entire country. [Applause.]

I append herewith the following letter:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, January 23, 1918.

Hon. C. W. RAMSEYER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. RAMSEYER: I have your letter of January 14 inclosing a copy of H. R. 8001 and requesting information regarding the number of farm owners, tenants, farm laborers, and retired farmers.

So far as I am aware, there is no information available on these points later than the census of 1910. An examination of the 1910 census figures show that the total farming population between the ages of 18 and 60 at that time was 9,304,700, of which 3,372,500 were farm owners, 55,600 were managers, 2,051,400 were tenants, and 3,825,200 were farm laborers. The census reports do not give any information regarding the number of retired farmers. On the basis of farm surveys made in different parts of the country, it has been estimated that the number of retired farmers not engaged in any gainful occupation is approximately 1,400,000, of which about one-half, or 700,000, probably are under 60 years of age. The department has no information as to the number of male persons previously engaged in agriculture who are now employed in some other vocation not necessary to the maintenance of the Military Establishment.

The Department of Agriculture has been giving very active attention to the farm-labor problem. It recognizes that the situation is serious and has been doing, and is doing, everything in its power to furnish relief. The inclosed statement indicates some of our activities in this direction and suggests what seems to me to be the most promising lines of effort. As indicated in the statement, a farm-labor specialist has been stationed in nearly every State of the Union to cooperate with State and Federal agencies in dealing with the matter. The department also is working in very close harmony with the Department of Labor and especially with the various employment offices of that department located in different sections of the country. In order to ascertain the possible needs of farmers and to determine ways of meeting them, a systematic survey of the farm-labor situation will be made by the department before the beginning of the next crop season through its agents stationed in the various States and in cooperation with the Department of Labor and the State councils of defense.

Arrangements already have been made with 37 States to undertake such a survey. Farm-help specialists of the department, with the cooperation of the extension departments of the agricultural colleges and the field agents of the Bureau of Crop Estimates, will promptly tabulate the results, and the department will then have reliable information regarding the prospective labor needs on farms throughout the country.

It should be borne in mind that many of the disturbing factors of last year in the farm-labor situation have been eliminated, and therefore in some respects the problem may not be quite so acute another year. Naturally the disturbances are much more violent immediately after a great shock has been given the industrial system. This Nation had been organized on a peace basis. When it entered the war it was necessary not only to create vast additional facilities and machinery, but also to provide on an enormous scale for the operation of the new establishments and of those previously existing. Many shipyards had to be expanded and others had to be created. Large cantonments had to be built, and built quickly. In every direction there were urgent demands for great expansions. Furthermore, it was necessary to have an Army, and this necessarily caused additional labor drains and dislocations. In the haste of the first draft it was impossible to work out a satisfactory classification of labor with reference to the national needs.

The Army cantonments and many of the aviation fields and camps have now been completed and will not have to be duplicated. A part of the great industrial expansion has been accomplished. The new regulations promulgated by the War Department provide a system of classification of the men subject to the draft which contemplates the placing of skilled farm labor engaged in necessary agricultural enterprises in class 2, assistant or associate managers of necessary agricultural enterprises in class 3, and heads of necessary agricultural enter-

prises in class 4. The Secretary of War has asked Congress for authority to furlough soldiers of the National Army whenever the interests of the service or the national security and defense render it necessary or desirable during harvest and planting time, to enable them to assist in the agricultural production of the country. It is reasonable to suppose that, in view of these facts, many of the difficulties previously encountered will be removed or minimized. However, it is well to recognize that the situation will continue to be difficult and that a satisfactory solution will require the best thought of the Nation and the fullest and most complete cooperation of all agencies. The matter will continue to receive the earnest consideration not only of the Department of Agriculture but also of other branches of the Government, including especially the Department of Labor and the Council of National Defense.

Very truly, yours,

D. F. HOUSTON,
Secretary.

Mr. LEE of Georgia. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I trust I will not be deemed either censorious or presumptuous by taking this opportunity to present some observations upon one phase of the state of the war which, in my judgment, is entirely worthy of the earnest consideration of the entire membership of the House, and which challenges the real patriotism of America. I bespeak the indulgence of both sides of the Chamber. What I shall say will not offend any, but I trust may make some impression for fruitful thought upon both my Republican and Democratic colleagues.

The main thought is this: In the midst of and throughout this war, until it shall end in triumph for our arms, we owe it to the country and ourselves and to our cause to give to our Commander in Chief the full measure of sympathetic and helpful aid, comfort, and assistance, and, in addition thereto, to stand behind and back to the limit his policies, and to grant the adequate powers he asks us to grant. We are engaged in a life-and-death struggle with the most malignant form of centralized temporal power, and it might appear illogical and inconsistent to advocate the lodgment of such powers during the period of the war in our own Commander in Chief, but a correct and dispassionate analysis of both the psychology and logic of our necessities will refute and dispel such probable criticism. Because, by the fickle fortuity of the ballot the present Commander in Chief happens to be a member of my own political faith does not alter or modify in the least the inherent soundness of the philosophy sought to be impressed, nor should the natural inclination of the partisan in ordinary times to make capital out of the vulnerable mistakes or blunders of the opposition prevent that partisan in an hour like this from approaching the subject with a very high order of intellectual candor, and should not estop him from asking himself this question: "When the citadel of my country's security and life is assailed, within and without, by most formidable and dangerous adversaries, what can I do to help save it from destruction?" And I submit this proposition with the full knowledge that the present Executive has able and honorable opponents, both in the ranks of the opposition and within his own party.

But to revert to the main proposition. Ask any Member of this House to-day, "What, in the present posture of affairs, do you consider your paramount duty to your home people and the National Government?" and his instantaneous reply will be: "To do everything in my power, by vote, act, counsel, and effort, to bring this terrible war to a speedy and triumphant conclusion." If he does not make that answer, he has no adequate or commendable conception of his moral, political, or representative duty. Mark the matter of his answer—not a tithe or fragment of his possibilities, but everything that he can do. And surely one of the things we all can do is to remember that under our Constitution the President is, whether he ought to be or not, the one person clothed with the power and authority and directly charged with the responsibility of conducting our naval and military operations. The presumption is that for the time being he is the ablest and best equipped man in the country for such a trust; otherwise he would not have been commissioned by the Nation to assume it. The people of this country have said: "We call Woodrow Wilson up out of the multitude of his fellow citizens for this task," and the Constitution says: "Woodrow Wilson, I lay upon you as the elect of your people the great burden of leading and directing the operations and policies of this war, and therein fall not, for by my mandate you alone must answer for this terrible responsibility to your people and to posterity." It would have been the same edict had Charles E. Hughes been the present occupant of the White House. It will be the same in the future if—may Almighty God forbid it—we engage in war. It is our system, and it is a good system. It is so excellent in its conception and ideal administration that I invoke the adherence of Congress and the country to its profound desirability now and hereafter.

No measure of that responsibility is lodged upon the shoulders of Congress in its true significance. We have the exclusive power of declaring war, and we have the duty of raising moneys,

to carry it on, and the legislative function of furnishing the agencies and instrumentalities for its prosecution, but there our prerogative ends, and when we attempt to go further we usurp a function not bestowed by warrant of the Constitution and occupy untenable and precarious ground.

The facts of history show how indispensable to military success is the bestowal or assumption of full and unquestioned authority, plenary and absolute, in one head and hand. What would have been the careers of Caesar, Cromwell, Napoleon, or Alexander without it? And what dreary and dismal results where not reposed! I cite as an instance the lamentable debacle in Russia, where every newly liberated citizen held himself entitled to vote or act through a committee on questions of military movements and administrative policy. God save this Nation from accomplishments such as the Bolsheviks have achieved.

I do not mean to intimate that we should blindly close our eyes to the deficiencies and remediable mistakes or even blunders that may have been made by subalterns of the President to whom specific duties of equipment and preparation have been intrusted. To do so would be supine and stupid. But I submit to every thoughtful Member, that instead of using such examples as a pretext for intemperately arraigning our whole scheme and system, they can and should be used as things hereafter to be sedulously avoided, and thereby to perfect and strengthen our program of ultimate preparation.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. My friend, I have only a very limited time, and I fear I can not yield.

I beg no man to withhold helpful, friendly, constructive criticism, but I beseech men high and low alike to refrain, for their country's sake, to stay the tongue of slander, intrigue, and mendacity.

But it will not aid us to say that all our war preparations have fallen down, or our initiative or organization are inherently faulty, for in addition to being untrue, such statements not only hearten the disloyal and seditious among us but terribly discourage our own patriotic citizens. We should rededicate ourselves to the cause of American solidarity and freedom; we should remember that every father and mother who has a son in the Army are not looking on their sacrifice as one of section or cult or party, but are sitting these winter nights in desolate homes, but with resolute hearts and heroic patience, awaiting the news of their boy's supreme sacrifice, if need be, in order that our Republic may live. Do not double their boy's jeopardy by divided and halting counsel and authority. And those men in the ranks—they care not for party quibble or personal spleen between those in authority, and it is nothing less than they should expect that all of us here in Washington should set them the inspiring example of national cohesion and an identical purpose. [Applause.]

Let me repeat, the great thing is to win this war at the earliest day. That happy day can only be delayed by discord and recrimination. It is of small concern to those who are making the master sacrifices of this tragic period as to who shall be Speaker of the next House of Representatives or what aspiring politician may have the bestowal of some sordid patronage. Speaking for myself alone, I would gladly surrender the political control of the House and the Senate, too, in the next election if I could thereby insure the saving of the lives of only a few of those gallant boys who are cheerfully offering their all to make men free and to save forever the peace and security of this Republic. [Applause.]

I fear that the end of this heart-sickening business of war may be a long way off. If so, our people must inevitably make sacrifices enough. Let them be not augmented by internal discord and malignant censure. Let us subordinate the whimsical and unprofitable and set our whole hearts upon the very desirable business of thrashing the eternal daylights out of the German Kaiser.

Remember, you northern men, what infinite anxiety and trouble the so-called copperheads gave Abraham Lincoln when he was dedicating his very soul to the task of saving the Union. Remember, all you men, from every State, that to-day the breed of the political copperhead is not extinct, and they are covertly seeking now to hamstring and hamper Woodrow Wilson, who is dedicating his very soul to the sublime task of saving civilization. [Applause.]

Mr. LEE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, how much time has been consumed in general debate?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] has consumed 4 hours and 27 minutes, and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] 4 hours and 50 minutes.

Mr. LEE of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. QUIN] 20 minutes.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman, what the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] said touching the loyalty we should show to our Commander in Chief, President Wilson, is indeed true, and I trust that the heart of every patriotic American will imbibe that same spirit.

This bill that is before the Congress now is not a war measure, and yet it constitutes the mudsills for the successful prosecution of this war. The agriculture of this country, the production of the fields, comes ahead of all, because no people can carry on a war unless they have full stomachs. Soldiers may have all the ordnance that the combined resources of the world may produce, they may have the finest cannon and musketry, cavalry, aeroplanes, and navy, but they would be bound to fail if they are not properly fed. They must have food.

The Agricultural Committee has brought forth a good bill for this coming fiscal year. The people of the United States of America are called upon not only to feed the people of this Republic and the soldiers of the United States but to provide food and provender for our allies in this great world conflict.

Labor has been taken from every field of activity in the United States. In all the industrial plants labor has been called to arms. From the fields devoted to the production of agricultural products young men have been called from the hoe and the plow to take up arms in defense of their country. Naturally there will be bound to be a smaller crop in 1918 than there was in 1917. The reason is apparent to all. Our land is no more productive this year than it was last and our labor is less. Where will the labor come from to produce the great corn crops that will be required? Where will that labor come from to produce the great wheat crops, all the food crops, and the cotton crops? Some people have an imaginary idea that you are going to get socialists and anarchists out of the cities to go to work out on the farms. You will never get one of those fellows from the cities to go to the farms and call in the hogs, take up the hoe, to get the mule out at daylight, and go to the field and plow. You are not going to get that type of men out in the country to split rails, build up fences, dig ditches, carry on farm operations. These city fellows do not know anything about farming. They can not even put gears on a horse or a mule, much less farm. It requires time, practical experience, and brains to be a farmer. The natural consequence is, my friends, that the farmers of this country, who work all day and part of the night, will not be able to get the great and abundant crops that the management of this war expects.

Then, it is incumbent on the Government to pursue the same activities in the same manner and in the same way, so far as money is concerned, to produce and conserve these farm products as the Departments of War and Navy have pursued in providing ordnance, equipment, and supplies to the soldiers and seamen who prosecute the war.

The Military Committee, of which I have the honor to be a member, does not talk in millions, like some of these other committees. Here sits Gov. SHALLENBERGER, of our committee, who knows that we are now talking about seven billions and eight billions, and the probability of going on up to \$10,000,000,000 to provide the United States with clothing and armament for our soldiers in the field. I happen to be chairman of the subsistence committee, a subcommittee of the Military Committee. Do you know what subsistence means? It means that these soldiers must have provided for them clothing to wear and food to put in their stomachs. Naturally I consider where this food is to come from, knowing in my own congressional district, as I do, the scarcity of labor; that thousands of men have been called from the farm to go into the Army. I know this same condition exists in every congressional district in the United States.

It must give us all concern as to whether or not we will be able to produce the necessary food to feed our 104,000,000 people and feed our soldiers in the camps and on the battle fields and on the battleships, and our allies in Europe, who have their man power on the battle field and in the industrial factories producing armament to prosecute the war. Every man in the United States must recognize the fact that not only what we produce must be conserved but that every ounce of energy of the men, women, and children on the farm must be exerted to produce to the utmost capacity in every line of productivity the food and clothing for the people of this country, our soldiers, and our allies.

As it now stands we are almost on the verge of breaking ground to begin planting our crops in the South. Whether or not the Government activity will provide the dehydrating plants discussed here in order that all the vegetables may be conserved and the water extracted from Irish and sweet potatoes and all kinds of vegetables, so that these food crops can be carried through the fall and winter to take the place of the scarce substantial, I do not know, but I do know tin has become very scarce and there may not be a sufficient quantity of tin cans to can all

the vegetables raised in the South and in the eastern portion of this Republic. It strikes me that it ought to be called to the attention of the Agricultural Department to ask them in this crisis to grant whatever amount of money is needed to conserve all the vegetables in this country so that in their dry state all food elements are intact, and in the winter months they may be put in the stomachs of the people. It occurs to me that the Agricultural Department, through its Bureau of Markets, would be able to see to it, now that the Government has control of the railroads of this country, that there is proper distribution of all perishable articles that come from the farms of this country, so that nothing could rot in transit, so that nothing would be on the road too long for lack of ice or because of overheating, which would destroy and make it useless for the human stomach. And that the Government could go further than that and lend its activities in getting the necessary fertilizers to the farmers to produce these vegetables, the corn and the wheat and the other food products, in order that we may not have that scarcity which seems to me impending in the food production of this country.

No doubt if this war continues another year there will be a rationing of our people. That time is going to come, and our people had just as well get prepared to put their stomachs on lighter rations morning, noon, and night. The patriotism is here. The people will be willing to do that, but can we call on our soldiers in the field to do on less in their stomachs? Then, the American Government should exert its whole influence in getting the necessary quantity of food produced from the fields of this country, and I believe our Government should look a long time before it takes too many of the young men from the farms and places them under the draft law into the Army. If there is a man that is essential, if there is a man indispensable to industry, it seems to me from what we see before us now, the farm worker, the farm manager, the producer of meat, the producer of corn, of vegetables, and of wheat is the most essential man in this Government to the successful prosecution of the war and the continuance of the different industries of our Republic.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Is it not true that the local draft boards can exempt these young men for agricultural purposes?

Mr. QUIN. I would say to the gentleman that under the orders of the Provost Marshal General the local boards are afraid that they would get in the penitentiary if they did that. Do you not know that all of the local boards in all of the rural communities of this country would love to do that very thing if they were not afraid of violating the law. I stated on the floor of this House when they had the draft bill up that the War Department did not intend to exempt the farmers. When some of you people were killing our voluntary bill and putting the conscript law on the books, I quoted what the Secretary of War said before our committee. I knew they were not going to exempt the farmers of the country. I endeavored to get that done in the committee. I saw it was necessary to leave the farmers on the farms to produce food. The War Department said they could not do it and be fair under all the principles of the law.

Apparently inspired editorial articles were sent out all over the country that the farmers were going to be exempted, and for that reason many farmers urged the passage of the bill, because it was going to exempt the farmers. Well, however that may be, it is water that has passed the wheel. We have the law on the books, in many respects a fine law, and all must obey it and live up to it, and the people are going to do that unhesitatingly everywhere; but now is the time for the War Department to realize that the farms must not have their labor taken away from them. What is the use of our committee putting up \$8,000,000,000 to carry on this war, with all of these things belching forth fire and lead and brimstone and hell and damnation on the Germans, unless you are going to have the farmers of the country with the necessary labor and ability produce the food to feed those soldiers and keep up our people and our allies?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIN. Yes.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I think the gentleman is borne out by the facts of experience that every nation that goes into war finds it is impossible to fight a war and at the same time increase their food and agricultural production. So to look the matter fairly in the face, I agree with the gentleman that we must prepare to save and ration and come to a lower consumption, rather than hope to meet this thing by an increased production as we go on. No nation has ever achieved that.

Mr. JACOWAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Mississippi yield until I ask the gentleman from Nebraska a question?

Mr. QUIN. Yes.

Mr. JACOWAY. I would like to ask the gentleman if he thinks it would materially lessen our chance of winning this war if furloughs could be extended to men who are now in the Army who have been taken from the farms, to go back and raise the crop for this year?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I think it would be the proper thing to furlough them back to the farms.

Mr. QUIN. I desire to say that every man who realizes the necessity of the production of food thinks the same thing. Surely the Government would be served best if the farmers now doing soldier duty were furloughed back to their farms to make a crop of foodstuffs this year and that no more farmers be drafted during the year at least. But you can not get that notion into the War Department, and I can see why the War Department hesitates to do it, because they say, "We will demoralize the Army, and we can not afford to have the Army disrupted right here when they are crying for us to get trained soldiers into France." But we can keep them from taking any more men from the fields at this time if the War Department can ever see this matter as I do. We must have food just as much as we must have guns and ammunition.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIN. I will.

Mr. SLOAN. Is it more difficult to get an impression of that kind into the War Department than some others? The gentlemen say it is difficult to get that into the War Department.

Mr. QUIN. They are the ones who have the drafting of these men. Do you know we have on the statute books the draft law that allows them to exempt every man from any essential or indispensable place? As I see, the exigencies of the occasion are arising where it is necessary under the very terms of that bill to keep this indispensable and essential labor on the farm. What foolishness it looks to me to take a man from a farm who can produce thousands of bushels of corn and great droves of hogs and cattle, to take him from the farm and put him in the Army to serve as a private which you could get from any class that produces nothing of material aid for the Government in this war. The Government is taking from the farm able-bodied young white men who are producing food, the very thing we must have to properly carry on this war. It seems to me that the War Department ought to realize the necessity of what I suggest as to leaving these powers on the farms; and how can it realize it unless the question is agitated on the floor of Congress? Some people say it is not fair to leave these farmers back home and take somebody else. It is not altogether a question of fairness; it is a question of absolute necessity and what is best for the Government in this crisis, and so it looks to me that farmers should not be taken into the Army now.

Mr. MORGAN rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. QUIN. I can not yield now. Consider the men producing the ammunition in these factories, and you know it will not do to take all of those factory workers who are producing our cartridges, our artillery, our rifles, and our powder. Is the rifle, is the cannon, is the artillery of any more importance than food? If we were to have a food famine in this country, like the coal famine in the eastern portion of this Republic here in the last five weeks, what do you think our people would do? They would, when they get hungry, when they get into desperate straits, act like wild people. Hunger will drive the best people to desperation, as when they broke in all those show windows and bread-basket places in New York City. That desperation would run rampant from one end of this Republic to the other. It would be the case, because people grow desperate when they get hungry for a long time, and if you have a famine, how could the war continue? How could you prosecute it if people at home and abroad are crying for meat and bread? If God sends plenty of rain and good snows on our farms, and the farmers and their wives and children work with all of their energy, we can not expect to have as much food produced as we will need. Too many farmers are in the Army, and too many have gone into the factories.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. QUIN. I thank you, gentlemen. [Applause.]

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CONNELLY of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROBBINS].

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Chairman, I shall not devote the time given to me to a strict discussion of this bill, because it has already been analyzed and discussed very extensively and very ably by the members of the committee and others.

There is, however, passing over the United States at the present time a wave of dissatisfaction with the management of the war by the administration. The immediate cause of this outburst of public opinion was the speech made by Senator CHAMBERLAIN, chairman of the Military Committee of the Senate, and he by reason of his position is supposed to know more about the conditions of the Army and Navy and the deficiencies in the management of the war, if any exist, than any other man in Congress.

At a public dinner given in his honor last week in New York he made this declaration:

The Military Establishment of America has fallen down. There is no use to be optimistic about a thing that does not exist. It has almost stopped functioning because of inefficiency in every bureau and department.

This statement from a Democratic Senator who occupies the most prominent position in the Senate, so far as the management of the war is concerned, is startling, and it has shocked the American people. It was of sufficient importance to draw from the President a prepared statement in answer and denial, in which he states:

Senator CHAMBERLAIN's statement as to the present inaction and ineffectiveness of the Government is an astonishing and absolutely unjustifiable distortion of the truth.

Thus we have the issue between the Executive and a leading Democratic Senator as to the management of this war.

There has been no opposition in Congress from the Republican Party, or any considerable number of it, as to the management of the war by the President.

Personally I have voted for every measure the administration asked or desired in the prosecution of the war against Germany and have unhesitatingly supported the administration and the President in every effort looking toward that end, and it is my plan and purpose to continue to support the administration most earnestly in all war legislation until the war is ended and American arms victorious. [Applause.]

But the Senate Committee on Military Affairs has recently investigated the conditions in the cantonments, of the troops in France; and of the various inactivities of the War Department; and, while this testimony has not been printed and, I am informed, will not be published in full, but only in part, yet the press reports have shown that the troops in the field are without sufficient clothing; that the large death list from pneumonia, measles, and mumps is largely the result of undue exposure in overcrowded tents and incomplete hospitals; that hospitals are in some cases without heat or water or toilet facilities; that the troops are without sufficient guns; and that our Army in France is entirely without ordnance of our own make or providing. This testimony, so far as it has been printed in the public press, has been supplemented by the speeches and statements of the 10 Members of this Congress who have visited the battle front in France and Italy; and they have stated with unanimity and fierce emphasis that our troops in France are not properly protected by cannon, and to send them into the trenches now is to simply send them into a slaughter pen. We were compelled to buy clothing from England and guns and ordnance from France. With these facts before us, the question that confronts every Member of Congress is, Is it right to sit still and remain quiet and simply say that the responsibility of fighting this war is on the President? While that is true, that therefore Congress may remain silent and allow these conditions to continue, or are we not rather duty bound as a part of the Government and responsible to the people, at least for all legislation affecting the war, now, by constructive suggestion, by high patriotic advice, to aid in every way we can the administration in bettering these conditions and in overcoming these and other difficulties and inefficiencies that are now hindering and delaying our war preparations?

No man ought to be characterized as lacking in patriotism or ought to be charged with playing politics or be accused of unfair criticism of the administration when he seeks in good faith to make suggestions that will, he believes, overcome existing failures or give advice that will lead to ultimate success and bring about the complete overthrow of German militarism. No one appreciates, I think, more than I do the magnitude of this war and the rapid expansion of our Military Establishment. Fifteen years' service in the National Guard of Pennsylvania, part of which time as a private soldier,

and finally in the capacity of commissary general of the State, together with my service in the United States Army, covering the entire period of duration of the Spanish-American War, has given me some knowledge of military affairs.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. ROBBINS. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. Just touching the question of criticism. Is it not a fact, recognized in education, literature, and politics that criticism is more wholesome and contributes more to good and betterment than praise?

Mr. ROBBINS. I think fair criticism, given in good faith, does. That is as far as I am going to go. Yet I believe the present management of the war lacks coordination; lacks unity of purpose; lacks harmony of action; and above all there is inefficiency in the execution of plans that has produced startling failures in the War Department. Not every plan has failed by any means, not every officer is incompetent, but there are too many failures.

It is true, under our form of government, the President of the United States is the constitutional head of the Nation and the Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy. Congress can not legally interfere with the management or conduct of the war. No Congressman or body of Congressmen, and certainly no party, in Congress wishes to interfere, but there is a widespread feeling in Congress and throughout the country that having voted ungrudgingly and quickly unprecedented large sums of money to the administration to be used in preparing this Nation for war, that Congress ought to at least be permitted to know and be allowed to act with the administration in a broad, high-minded, nonpartisan, patriotic way, for the purpose of obtaining results from the expenditure of this money.

Personally I believe the President, when war was thrust upon us, should have adopted the plan for the war which has proven successful in France, England, and Italy, by organizing a nonpartisan Cabinet.

When Mr. Lincoln became President of the United States, with rebellion threatening the Nation, he wisely selected a nonpartisan Cabinet. The Secretary of State was William H. Seward, of New York, a Whig; Secretary of the Treasury Salmon P. Chase, of Ohio, was a Democrat; Secretary of War Simon Cameron, of Pennsylvania, was a Democrat, succeeded by Edward M. Stanton, of Ohio, a Democrat; Secretary of the Interior Caleb B. Smith, of Indiana, was a Democrat; Secretary of Navy Gideon Welles, Connecticut, was a Democrat; Postmaster General Montgomery Blair, of Maryland, was a Republican, formerly a Whig; Attorney General Edward Bates, of Missouri, was a Whig. Judge Davis said of this Cabinet:

Lincoln's original design was to appoint Democrats and Republicans alike to office. He carried this theory so far that the radical Republicans regarded the make-up as a "disgraceful surrender to the South," while men of less extreme views saw with some alarm that he called to his advisory council four ex-Democrats and only three ex-Whigs, a criticism which he met by saying that he himself was an "Old-Line Whig" and would be there to make the parties even.

This plan of Mr. Lincoln worked out admirably; it drew to the support of the war all political parties. It became a national war, not a war in which one party is entirely excluded from the active management, and the Cabinet then actually took a part in executive action, with all parties represented in the Cabinet. All our people felt that they were represented, and the war soon became a great national war.

During the recess of Congress I made many speeches in my district and adjacent parts of Pennsylvania upholding vigorously the administration, and advocating most strenuously the prosecution of this just and righteous war to a successful termination.

The situation now demands of every citizen the highest patriotic service that he can render, whether in official life or out of it. We must all be Americans, we must all rise to the highest plane of patriotic devotion and unselfish and unhesitating, vigorous service, and do everything we can to assist the administration in the crisis that confronts us.

It does seem that the organization of the War Department is not working smoothly. The charges made appear to be undeniable, that there is lack of coordination between the purchasing departments of the Army, that they have been bidding against each other until prices have been advanced and industries disorganized. The first shipbuilding organization has gone to pieces. There has been an attempt to reorganize it, with what success is not yet known. It is admitted on all hands that it is away behind with its work and its accomplishments are practically very little up to this time. This can easily be explained by the confusion that seems to prevail in that department of the Government. Let me give a concrete case in point. A large industry in my district that manufactures valves, brass stopcocks, and fittings for the engines of

these ships which the Shipping Board are to build has by the Fuel Director been directed to stop all operations to save fuel. How are these ships to be built and completed when the Fuel Director will not permit the manufacture of the necessary fittings required to finish them? This company is, moreover, subject to a penalty if they do not complete the work in a given time. Yet the Fuel Director, disregarding this, prevents them from working. This concern, it seems, is going to get it both coming and going. If it does not make the engine fittings, the ships can not be built and it will be compelled to pay a penalty; if it works it will be fined by the Fuel Administration.

There are seven or more such purchasing departments for the Army, hence there necessarily is overlapping of jurisdiction, competitive bidding in the market, confusion, and delay. No private corporation of much less magnitude than the United States Government for one moment would tolerate such confusion and inefficiency. To point this out is not treason against the Government nor disloyalty to the President, but it is merely a suggestion seeking to draw attention to an existing glaring evil with the hope that it may be remedied. I might present and analyze other bureaus of the War Department and show that this inefficiency seems to prevail to an alarming extent throughout some of its other branches.

Under the act of Congress providing for the national defense there has been organized in connection with the War Department about 150 committees. These are known as the \$1 a year men, and these include some of the most efficient men in the country, but they find themselves without any power, and they have in a great many instances quit, and the usefulness of most of the others seems to be at a standstill.

The Republican Members of Congress in conference in the face of this crisis passed a resolution, not condemning the President, not proposing to interfere with the President, but, profiting by the experience of Great Britain and France, as we have a right to profit from their experience, which has been sad and expensive to them, respectfully suggesting to the President the propriety of establishing a bureau of munitions.

This suggestion is made from the highest patriotic impulse and motive. It springs from the hope that the President may turn to the example of Mr. Lincoln, and under this new authority, if given to him by Congress, organize a bipartisan war bureau of the biggest men in the Nation regardless of politics, who shall act under him and aid and help him in more definitely organizing and preparing this Nation to fight Germany and bring quickly to the relief of our hard-pressed allies a completely equipped and efficiently organized military force.

This proposition is constructive. It is in aid of the President; it takes away none of his powers, but it enlarges his authority and enables him to call in the greatest talent in the country in any special line that he may deem proper and use it. This bureau, appointed and selected by the President, will be under his direct control and supervision and responsible to him alone. By means of it he can lift from his own shoulders some of the burdens that doubtless oppress him. By constantly advising with such board that unity of purpose, that effectiveness of action and completeness of accomplishment will be brought about that is not now possible in the preparation for and management of this great war.

Indeed, this course of fair public discussion and suggestion is in complete accord with the principles laid down for our guidance by the President in such cases. The Boston Transcript recently published the following extract from Woodrow Wilson's (now President) work on "Congressional Government":

Unless Congress have and use every means of acquainting itself with the acts and disposition of the administrative agents of the Government the country must be helpless to learn how it is being served, and unless Congress both scrutinize these things and sift them by every form of discussion the country must remain in embarrassing and crippling ignorance of every force which it is most important that it should understand and direct.

The informing function of Congress should be specially preferred even to its legislative function. The argument is not only that the discussed and interrogated administration is the only pure and efficient administration, but more than that that the only well self-governing people is that people which discusses and interrogates its administration.

It is the principle upon which I shall act and upon which I hope every upright and faithful servant of the people in Congress will act.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. ROBBINS. I ask for two minutes more.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman two minutes more.

Mr. ROBBINS. If this was good doctrine when the President was a professor at Princeton University teaching the science of government, it ought to be good now in practice.

Let us rise to the occasion. Let it not be said that this is a political move or partisan action. It is entirely American, it is wholly patriotic, and it is purely loyal. Mr. Chairman, when the casualties begin to come back from the front the mothers and widows of Americans will accept no excuse if it should appear that these men have been sacrificed unduly by reason of lack of preparation, even in the minutest detail.

The undertaking before us is of such tremendous magnitude that we must throw aside all our personal feelings, our personal affiliations, our personal comfort, and our personal fortunes and make one grand united effort to quickly win this war for freedom and for America. The course above advocated will certainly, I firmly believe, bring about such result, and I submit it for the respectful consideration of the President and of Congress. [Applause.]

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DICKINSON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to discuss some features of this Agricultural bill, and for that purpose I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to my friend from Texas, Mr. BLANTON.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I likewise want to discuss some of the features of the bill, and I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks generally.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LARSEN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. LARSEN. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to make a speech at this time, but I rise to state that I desire to express my views on this bill, and ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, how does the time stand?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] has consumed 4 hours and 55 minutes. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] has consumed four hours and seven minutes.

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman from Iowa that I have only one more request for time on this side. How many has the gentleman?

Mr. HAUGEN. I have three more that I have promised and would like to accommodate.

Mr. LEVER. Very well. I will ask the gentleman from Iowa to use some of his time now. I will use mine later.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALDOW].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. WALDOW. Mr. Chairman, for a Member of Congress to launch an attack upon the executive or administrative branch of this Government in the midst of the greatest war the world has ever known is assuming an enormous responsibility, and on the other hand to accept without question conditions entailing tremendous consequences is to accept an equally grave responsibility.

I will not attempt to criticize to any great extent any of the executives or their departments, but I confess to a belief that there is the gravest necessity for immediate reorganization in many of our present executive and administrative departments. The decision taken by the Fuel Administrator proclaiming a compulsory suspension of business was a drastic decision and can only be justified by the urgent necessity of relieving railroad congestion—the securing of coal for ships in our ports, and the individual need for coal throughout the northeastern section of this country. That the conditions which have led to the present state of things should never have been permitted to occur may be admitted without question. I believe such an order would have been unnecessary if better judgment and foresight had been used three or four months ago when transporta-

tion upon our railroads and rivers was not handicapped by ice and snow. If that order and the more recent one of an embargo upon freight will relieve the present situation and prevent a food and fuel famine in this country this winter, I believe that their autocratic demands upon the industrial institutions and the people of this country will be a justification for their issuance. The cost in dollars and individual sacrifice of that order and that embargo I know will be tremendous, but if we prevent a coal and food famine and are able by virtue of this experience to prevent a repetition in the future of this present critical condition I believe the experience will be worth the price the American people have had to pay.

There can be no question that moments will arrive during this great war when heroic remedies become conservative policy by reason of the very fact that they are necessary to prevent more radical or perhaps disastrous consequences.

Mr. Chairman, this bill carries an appropriation of about \$26,000,000. This sum fades into insignificance in comparison with the billions that will be necessary to be raised by bonds and taxation and appropriated for war purposes. I hope the Members of this House will in the near future present a new revenue bill to the country that will distribute the burden of taxation in a more just and equitable manner than the one now in operation. I am very candid in stating that unless this course is pursued many of the large industrial concerns in my State and city will be forced into bankruptcy.

I am interested not so much with the past as I am with the future. I am gravely disturbed with the business conditions and their present outlook in this country, and when the business of this country is violently disturbed and demoralized every man, woman, and child's personal welfare is at stake.

I refer particularly to the assumption and statement of some Government officials that in order to win this war we will be compelled to abandon all business known as nonessential. I sincerely hope that the executive department of this Government will not be in haste to act, and that they will investigate from every possible angle and point of view before issuing a proclamation upon essential and nonessential business undertakings—and if nonessential is going to be interpreted to exclude everything except that which is really a part of our war machine, then I predict the greatest financial panic and disaster and the greatest suffering for our citizens that this country has ever known.

The business interest and the people of this country are in favor of a curtailment of the use and the restricting of the manufacturing of the real luxuries of life. Most of us are practicing economy, which I hope will become a habit, for that will enable us to meet after the war industrial conditions without experiencing deprivations and financial distress, and this saving habit will assist materially in the floating of new bond issues and future Red Cross contributions that are really essential for the winning of this war.

Mr. Chairman, American business and American business men realize that the present predicament of commerce and industry is a concrete demonstration of the fact that business as usual is impossible when our Nation is at war. The fact that our industrial organization is one long series of interlocking gears must be taken into consideration when the breaking of a single cog is apt to be the means of stopping industrial cooperation of our entire industrial machine. This, I believe, will be vital not only to a successful prosecution of our war but to the future self-preservation of our business, our citizens, and our Nation. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McFADDEN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. McFADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to speak on this bill, but on another subject that is equally as important as this bill at the present time.

This is an industrial war. The greatest financial and industrial organization and the biggest brains that the country possesses are what is needed, and needed now, for to-morrow may be too late. I am wondering whether in the administering of the legislation already enacted recently—legislation said to be necessary to win the war—we have not, in the machinery created, provided a theoretical system which is proving a failure. In other words, are we not now in this the country's greatest crisis living in a theorist's paradise?

In support of that argument I may say that I am receiving constantly letters respecting the situation referred to. I quote from one the following:

The President's statement contained in to-day's papers can be construed as nothing less than a demand for autocratic powers.

His demand that he be allowed to conduct the war without regard to the wishes of Congress, or the people as expressed by Congress, is a contradiction to the public rights as guaranteed by the Constitution.

As between the President and the Constitution, I stand by the Constitution.

It is intolerable that this country be under the rule of the President under the terms which he indicates.

The Garfield lockout edict is but the beginning of many such measures which would follow.

It is distressing to oppose the President. It is distressing to cause any additional delay of anything tending to further prosecution of the war, but in this instance our rights are at stake, and I call upon you as the Representative in Congress from this district to fight for our rights.

I want to quote from another letter from a constituent. I read:

I am one of your constituents from whom you do not hear very frequently, the last occasion being at the time war was declared on Germany, when I asked for your vote in favor of the declaration. The events of the last few weeks, culminating in Dr. Garfield's order closing all the factories and the President's defense of his program and of Secretary Baker, have convinced me that we are now confronted by a crisis no less real than that of last April; that if affairs are allowed to drift on in the direction they have taken we shall become so hopelessly entangled that we shall be in a fair way to lose the war we are righteously waging, not for want of courageous men or material resources but because the Nation's most effective weapon—the executive and administrative ability of her most capable business men and engineers in private industries—is not being directly utilized in cutting away the antiquated and needless complications of established institutions so as to put them on an effective war basis and in building up new organizations when they are necessary. It is true that business men are called upon to advise and suggest, but they are not appointed to the places of power and authority, and their best efforts are thus nullified.

It is needless to recount the results of the administration's past policy in the matter of appointments to anyone who has been in touch with national affairs as you have. The pitiable inability to understand the relation of government to business, the woeful lack of comprehension of their own jobs, displayed by Secretary Baker and Fuel Administrator Dr. Garfield before the Senate committees are too evident to need pointing out. We do not expect that every man appointed will prove to be ideal for his place, but we have a right to expect that the selection shall be made with some regard for previous experience and probable fitness for his duties, and that when incompetence has been clearly shown, the man who has failed shall be speedily replaced.

The people of this country, no less than those of France and England, are ready and glad to make any sacrifice that will contribute to the success of our cause, but our temper is fast changing, because we feel that much is being required that is nothing less than camouflage for some one's failure to handle his job, and in view of this unmistakable change, I believe that there should be a corresponding change in the attitude of Congress from one of unquestioning, almost blind acquiescence in every request made by the administration, to one of insistence upon a businesslike use of the unprecedented powers already conferred.

This serious situation as regards coal is caused primarily by the failure of the administration to fix, in the first instance, a fair and equitable price for the coal at the mines, and then by not having a competent business man with knowledge of the subject to administer the department. The railroad situation was caused by interference on the part of the Government with the technical business of running a railroad, and, in the second place, by a combination between the two departments—fuel and railroad—and the fact that the industries were speeded up and exceeded the ability of the railroads to handle the increased business under the restrictions imposed and the insistence on the part of department heads in the War Department upon issuing priority orders for goods not immediately needed, together with not sufficient coordination of these heads. That is responsible for this serious breakdown.

I want to protest against a policy that would close industries, whether it be by embargo, proclamations from the Railroad Administrator, or by the Fuel Administrator, or by the manipulation of the Federal reserve banks or other banks refusing loans to industry, or in any other way restricting the full operation of the industries of the country, first, to furnish the materials necessary for the Government to win the war, and, second, to furnish employment affording a livelihood to the great mass of people who depend on their favorable employment for their existence.

We need the full cooperation of all of the industries of this country, and if we do not get that our system is going to break down.

To my mind it is a most serious situation that confronts us. Some people say, "Shut down the manufacture of nonessentials." I do not know what nonessentials are. I wish somebody would explain to me what are nonessentials. We certainly must keep industry going to the extent of supplying the things that are necessary for the Government to win this war; and, secondly, we must keep the network of industries going to supply employment to men who are engaged in other production, who must live and by their work support their families, or else we will have a more serious condition internally than might be brought about by the war. [Applause.]

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. RANDALL].

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, the consideration of this great bill, the Agricultural appropriation bill, may well consume four or five days of time. In times of peace agriculture is the most important question of mankind. In time of war agriculture rises higher than the military, naval, or diplomatic affairs of a nation. Agriculture spells life or death for the people of a nation and of the world.

Just now we are encouraging increased production, and in many ways we are urging conservation of our products—of food and fuel.

Some months ago the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture brought before this House a measure designed to conserve food supplies by giving the Food Administration power to save the grains, sugar, and fruits wasted in the manufacture of beer and wine. That act has now been on the statute books for months.

In spite of that fact, Mr. Chairman, I hold here in my hand a letter signed by Mr. Hoover, the Food Administrator, in which he admits that he is permitting the destruction of 42,000,000 bushels of barley annually in the manufacture of beer. He says nothing about the 2,000,000 bushels of rice, the 10,000,000 bushels of corn, and the millions of pounds of sugar which go into the manufacture of beer, not whisky. All of this after the 30 per cent reduction recently ordered in production.

I ask the distinguished chairman of this committee, when this barley alone will make four million 1-pound loaves of bread daily, why his committee does not bring in an amendment to his bill making it compulsory upon the Food Administration to save this food?

And while we are speaking of the food wasted by brewers, let me remind you that the brewers are adding to the problems of the Fuel Administrator also. It takes a pound of coal to make a pint of beer.

Why, Mr. Chairman, the brewers of the United States use three and one-half times as much coal as all the bakeries do, nearly six times as much coal as all the printers and publishers, nine times as much as the manufacturers of boots and shoes, and twenty times as much as the manufacturers of men's clothing.

And, Mr. Chairman, the Director General of Railroads finds on his tracks blocking the way of the food trains the fuel trains for homes and manufacturers, the munition trains, and the troop trains bearing our boys toward the battle front—literally thousands of cars of coal tagged to breweries and other thousands of cars of beer tagged back again.

Mr. Chairman, "What fools we mortals be!"

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record a statement from the census report of 1910 showing the amount of fuel used by brewers in the United States, and so forth.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

"BREWERS IN THE UNITED STATES USE OVER 3,000,000 TONS OF COAL."

"The latest authentic figures for the amount of coal used by the brewers in the production of malt liquor in the United States are given in the Government census reports for 1910, Volume VIII, page 363, as follows:

	Tons.
Anthracite	554,029
Bituminous	2,424,798
Coke	11,530
Total	2,990,357

"This equals 128,000 carloads of 25 tons each.

"In the year ending June 30, 1909, the production of malt liquors in the United States was 56,364,960 barrels. In 1917 the production was 60,729,509 barrels, an increase of 7.7 per cent over 1909. Assuming that there would be a proportionate increase in the amount of coal used, an addition of 7.7 per cent to the 2,990,357 tons used in 1909 gives 3,220,000 tons as the approximate amount used in 1917.

"BREWERS IN MASSACHUSETTS USE OVER 90,000 TONS OF COAL A YEAR."

"According to the same census report, the brewers of Massachusetts used, in the year 1909, 76,231 tons of coal. That year they produced 2,043,018 barrels of beer. In 1916 they produced 2,450,411 barrels, an increase of 19.9 per cent. Assuming a proportionate increase in coal used, gives the amount of coal used by the brewers in 1916 as approximately 91,400 tons.

"BREWERS USE MUCH MORE COAL THAN THE BAKERS."

"The real significance of the amount of coal used by the brewers, however, is better understood when taken in connection with the amount used by other leading industries in the United

States. On page 373 of Volume VIII of the census report for 1910 are given the following statistics:

Industry.	Cost of fuel and rent of power.	Total coal used.
		Tons.
Boots and shoes.....	\$1,847,885	332,758
Bread and baked goods.....	7,357,847	829,526
Clothing, men's.....	2,240,019	146,126
Printing and publishing.....	7,601,152	506,525
Liquors, malt.....	8,570,892	2,990,357
Liquors, distilled.....	1,500,049	841,410

"The above figures from the census reports reveal the fact that the brewers use three and one-half times as much coal as the bakers, nearly six times as much as the printers and publishers, nine times as much as the manufacturers of boots and shoes, and twenty times as much as the manufacturers of men's clothing.

"As the total cost of power and fuel for the various industries does not show the same ratio as the amounts of coal used, it is clear that some industries use more electric power or water power than others. It is significant, however, that the total cost of the power and fuel for the production of malt liquors is more than for the production of bread and baked goods, and over four and one-half times that for the manufacture of boots and shoes.

"Shall we be more tender with the profits of the brewers than with the lives of our sons?

"BREWERS OF MASSACHUSETTS USE THOUSANDS OF TONS OF COAL BUT EMPLOY FEW MEN.

"The following statistics, taken from the Massachusetts Supplement of the last United States census report (1910, p. 680, and Vol. VIII, p. 349), are very significant during these days of coal shortage:

Statistics of Massachusetts manufactures.

Industry.	Number establishments.	Capital.	Persons employed.	Total horsepower.	Total coal used in tons.
Boots and shoes.....	762	\$90,243,000	90,048	35,051	102,193
Bread and baked products.....	282	12,752,000	9,755	4,316	61,242
Clothing (men's).....	198	8,242,000	8,208	1,753	8,144
Liquors, malt.....	31	20,288,000	2,091	9,917	76,231

"The above figures reveal the fact that the manufacturers of boots and shoes employ forty-three times as many people but use only one and one-fourth times as much coal as the brewers. Capital invested four and one-half times as much. A specific example:

Industry.	Number establishments.	Persons employed.	Wages paid.	Cost of fuel.	Capital invested.
Lynn: Boots and shoes.....	207	17,942	\$9,532,137	\$53,656	\$17,488,156
Boston:					
Malt liquor.....	20	1,338	1,019,213	161,565	13,435,765
Boots and shoes.....	43	6,790	3,046,000	91,990	11,257,336

"The above figures taken from the Massachusetts Supplement of the last United States census report (1910, p. 684) reveal the facts that the boot and shoe manufacturers of Lynn employ thirteen and one-half times as many people, pay over nine times as much in wages, but use only one-third as much fuel as the manufacturers of malt liquors in Boston.

"The boot and shoe manufacturers in Boston employ five times as many people, pay three times as much in wages, and use fuel costing only a little over one-half as much as that used by the manufacturers of malt liquors in Boston.

"Which shall we close—the shoe factories making shoes for soldiers or the breweries turning food into alcohol?"

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. FAIRFIELD] five minutes.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Mr. Chairman, the attitude of the people of this country has been the right attitude of a great people toward an executive, burdened as the Chief Executive of the United States is with the most momentous problems that ever have confronted any country in any age. The spirit of this House has been the right spirit. I am glad to say that even in the conference the other night not one discordant note was uttered, so far as a desire to prosecute the war effectually was

concerned. True, there has recently been a little criticism. We are fighting the idea that the king can do no wrong, and in a free country it certainly is proper that the legislative department should become an informing body in its answer to the people. And as bearing immediate fruit of this criticism I call your attention to a statement in the Washington Star of this evening:

BUYER FOR ARMY APPOINTED BY U. S.—SECRETARY BAKER PICKS E. R. STETTINIUS TO SUPERVISE U. S. PURCHASES—BEGINS WORK AT ONCE.

Edward R. Stettinius, of New York, was appointed to-day as surveyor general for all Army purchases.

Secretary Baker in making the announcement said:

"Mr. Edward R. Stettinius, of New York, has been appointed surveyor general of all Army purchases. He will be in charge of the procurement and production of all supplies by the five Army bureaus, viz., Ordnance, Quartermaster, Signal, Engineer, and Medical. It will be his duty to coordinate such purchases and properly relate the same to industry, to the end that the Army program be developed under a comprehensive plan which will best utilize the resources of the country.

"From the outbreak of the war Mr. Stettinius has been in sole charge of the allied purchases in this country and has been responsible for the development of the production of war materials. His intimate knowledge of war conditions in Europe and in the United States, as related to industry, and the practical means he has used to accomplish his plans, preeminently qualify him for his position.

"Mr. Stettinius will assume his new duties at once and establish his office in Washington."

Gentlemen of the committee, it seems strange that not until the criticism had been voiced in another body, not until there had been suggestion of possible criticism on the floor of this House, was such action taken; but it is a source of gratification that promptly the effort is made to answer the constructive criticism that has been suggested, by following out the lines that have been indicated. I did not call attention to this any earlier, for the gentleman who spoke a few moments ago [Mr. ROBBINS] was urging, and properly urging, the very thing that the Secretary of War has undertaken to do.

I am concerned, gentlemen, more with the spirit of the country than I am with discussions that may arise here now and then. Above all else we ought to keep the spirit of the country united behind the Government for efficiency in the prosecution of the war. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CRISP, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 9054, the Agricultural appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

CHOCTAWS AND CHICKSAWS.

The SPEAKER. There is a bill, H. R. 329, which is clearly a private bill and ought to be on the Private Calendar. By accident it went to the Union Calendar. Without objection, it will be changed to the Private Calendar.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, January 26, 1918, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting a proposed clause of legislation for inclusion in the urgent deficiency bill (H. Doc. No. 859); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication from the Secretary of State submitting supplemental estimates of appropriation required for the expenses of foreign intercourse for the fiscal years 1918 and 1919 (H. Doc. No. 860); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination and survey of San Francisco Bay, Cal. (H. Doc. No. 861); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. TIMBERLAKE, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 175) to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year 1915, and for prior years, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 258), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5559) to authorize a preference right of entry by certain Carey Act entrymen, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 259), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

The bill (H. R. 7558) granting an increase of pension to William A. Strong; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 9247) granting certain lands to Boise, Idaho, for park purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 9248) to prevent extortion, to impose taxes upon certain incomes in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9249) providing for the conservation of certain foodstuffs in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PADGETT: A bill (H. R. 9250) to provide promotion for retired officers performing active duty in time of war; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 9251) to relieve Congress from the adjudication of private claims against the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENT: A bill (H. R. 9252) to authorize the appointment of two colonels and four lieutenant colonels in the Veterinary Corps of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 9253) for the purpose of conferring citizenship upon all Indians and segregating the competent Indians from the supervision of the Indian Bureau; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MCLEMORE: Resolution (H. Res. 235) authorizing the District of Columbia Committee to investigate reports of an alleged scheme or conspiracy by certain real estate dealers or agents to get possession of the National Guard Armory Building and to rent it to the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. REAVIS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 228) to provide notification of illness of soldiers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 229) to permit the naturalization of certain aliens whose parents neglected to take out naturalization papers prior to their death, to relieve a large number of persons from unmerited hardships, and to strengthen the military resources of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MOORES of Indiana: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 230) authorizing and requiring the Secretary of War to prescribe all rules and needful regulations for the government of the various internment camps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 9254) granting a pension to George F. Bostwick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions. Also, a bill (H. R. 9255) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Moses; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9256) granting an increase of pension to William Amspacher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 9257) granting an increase of pension to Michael McCormick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRAGO: A bill (H. R. 9258) for the relief of Andrew Ohler; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DEWALT: A bill (H. R. 9259) granting a pension to John A. Ferree; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DICKINSON: A bill (H. R. 9260) granting a pension to Sarah Weaver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 9261) granting an increase of pension to Eleam Welch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9262) granting an increase of pension to James Flanagan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9263) granting an increase of pension to George Rush; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9264) granting an increase of pension to Josiah Vauscyre; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9265) granting an increase of pension to Joshua Markley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9266) granting an increase of pension to Jerry A. Fitzgerald; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9267) granting an increase of pension to George Bowery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9268) granting an increase of pension to Michael P. Wells; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOULD: A bill (H. R. 9269) for the relief of Capt. Fred S. Johnston; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LEA of California: A bill (H. R. 9270) granting an increase of pension to Hiram E. Turner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEVER: A bill (H. R. 9271) granting a pension to Ja Dee Stroman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MAPES: A bill (H. R. 9272) granting a pension to Louisa M. Robinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MILLER of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 9273) for the relief of Alfred B. Andrews; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOORES of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 9274) granting a pension to Charlotte Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PAIGE: A bill (H. R. 9275) granting a pension to Edwin D. Goodell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROSE: A bill (H. R. 9276) granting an increase of pension to Robert Dignan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCHALL: A bill (H. R. 9277) granting an increase of pension to Silas C. Robbins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 9278) granting an increase of pension to Jahue H. Greenway; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWITZER: A bill (H. R. 9279) granting an increase of pension to Adam A. Worthington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9280) granting a pension to Elmer Kinder; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WARD: A bill (H. R. 9281) for the relief of Lieut. Col. Henry C. Davis; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 9282) granting a pension to the minor children of Ephraim G. Gray; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Memorial of Illinois Audubon Society, favoring the migratory-bird-treaty bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Resolutions of the Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association and the Knitting Manufacturers of Philadelphia, protesting against the fuel order; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolution of the physicians' group of the Chamber of Commerce, Philadelphia, Pa., objecting to that part of the war-revenue act dealing with the income of physicians; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of the Veterans' Home, Napa County, Cal., for the relief of volunteer officers of the Civil War, placing them on the same footing as officers of the Regular Army; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petition of war council of the Providence (R. I.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring passage of daylight-saving legislation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Petitions of R. C. Sutton, Joseph Antenson, William Evans, and others, favoring passage of the Keating and Nolan wage bills; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, resolution of the board of representatives of Federal Employees' Union, No. 2, protesting against recommendation of the Postmaster General for the repeal of the act permitting postal employees to organize for their mutual welfare; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, resolutions adopted by the Miami Chamber of Commerce, urging Government improvement of the Florida Coast Line Canal; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORIN: Petition of the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Preachers' Meeting of the Methodist Episcopal Church, for immediate and complete war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PARK: Resolutions adopted by the student body of the Atlanta Law School, Atlanta, Ga., opposing the creation of a war cabinet, expressing confidence in and loyalty to the President, and deploring recent criticism; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, January 26, 1918.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We wait upon Thee, Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, before entering upon the duties of the hour, that the Members of this deliberative body may be better prepared to take up the problems which confront them and discharge with patience, insight, and clear vision every duty devolving upon them, in consonance with Thy Holy Will; that truth may have its sway, to the honor and glory of Thy Holy Name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

DIGEST AND MANUAL.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 236.

Resolved, That there be printed 2,000 copies of the Digest and Manual of the Rules and Practice of the House of Representatives for the second session of the Sixty-fifth Congress, the same to be bound and distributed under the direction of the Clerk and Doorkeeper of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, this is the usual resolution that is passed each year.

Mr. GILLET. There has been no change, has there, since the printing of the last one?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know what change there has been.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire the method of the distribution of these copies of the rules?

Mr. FOSTER. I think there are so many copies placed in the folding room that go to the Members; then I think there are a certain number that go into the document room unbound.

Mr. STAFFORD. Under prior practice I do not recall any copies ever having been placed to the credit of Members of the House. I think they should be.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the gentleman is mistaken; I am sure he is; and if he will go to the proper officer he will find that he can get so many from that officer always.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not think they are placed to the credit of Members in the folding room, but one has to make an application with the Clerk of the House or some other official for four copies, I believe it is.

Mr. FOSTER. I think that is the number.

Mr. STAFFORD. I would like to know why it is that we can not have these copies placed to the credit of the Members direct in the folding room, so that every Member may have them. I venture the prediction that one-half, perhaps, of the Members of the House do not know that there are copies of the rules available to them under these authorizations.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know about that, but they are always there, and they are available.

Mr. ESCH. They are secured through the House stationery room, and every Member is credited with four copies. Sometimes they do not know it or do not draw them, but they are credited with them.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think some provision should be incorporated in the resolution providing that the copies be placed to the credit of Members in the folding room.

Mr. FOSTER. That is all right, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. STAFFORD. Until that amendment is proposed, I shall object. I have no objection to the authorization.

Mr. FOSTER. They go to the folding room.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have no objection to the resolution, but I think there should be some such provision incorporated as to their distribution.

Mr. FOSTER. The resolution provides that they are to be distributed through the Clerk and the Doorkeeper of the House.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. May I say that for seven or eight years they have been placed in the folding room to the credit of each Member?

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to take issue with the gentleman. We have not had them to our credit in the folding room. As my colleague, Mr. Esch, has stated, they are distributed through the stationery room of the House. Members ought to know that these rules are available.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. OVERMYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by printing therein an address delivered by my colleague from Ohio, Mr. JOHN S. SNOOK, on the subject of the news-print situation, before the Ohio City Editors' Association on the 19th and 20th of the present month.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by printing therein a speech delivered by his colleague, Mr. SNOOK. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by printing therein a letter from an old soldier, Mr. Isaac T. Cross, of Seattle, Wash.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

WASHINGTON'S BIRTHDAY.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on the 22d of February next, Washington's Birthday, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] be permitted to address the House, after the approval of the Journal, for 30 minutes on the subject of the influence of Washington on modern government.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that on the 22d of February next, after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of business on the Speaker's table, not to interfere with privileged matters, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] be permitted to address the House for not to exceed 30 minutes on the subject of the influence of Washington on modern government. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PENSIONS.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill H. R. 9160, granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio calls up a pension bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk reported the bill by title.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Private Calendar.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9160) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—

The name of George W. Thomas, late of Company I, Twenty-sixth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.